A DEFENSE OF THE *Christian Sabbath.*

In Answer to

A TREATISE of Mr. *Tho. Bampfield*

Pleading for

SATURDAY-SABBATH.

4° E. 26. Th

BY

JOHN WALLIS, D.D. And Professor of *Geometry* in the University of *OXFORD*.

OXFORD,
Printed by LEONARD LICHFIELD.
MDCXCII.

A

DEFENSE

OF THE

Imprimatur,

In Answer to

JONATH. EDWARDS,

Vice-Can. Oxon.

SATURDAY-SABBATH

Sep. 17
1692.

BY

JOHN WALLIS, D.D. And Professor of Geometry
in the University of OXFORD.

OXFORD,

Printed by LEONARD LICHFIELD.

MDCXCII.

A

DISCOURSE

Concerning The

Christian Sabbath.

SIR, *June* 12. 1692.

I Had a while since a Book sent me by the Carrier (I know not well from whom) of Mr. *Thomas Bampfield*, which in the Title-Page, is said to be *Printed for the Author*, 1692. It is Concerning the *Sabbath*. Which he thinks should rather be Observed on what we call *Saturday*, than on what we call *Sunday*.

I should not, on this Account, give any Disturbance to the Peace or Practise of the Church where I live, so that a Sabbath be duly Observed as to the *Substantials* of it, though perhaps not upon what day I should chuse.

For I do not know, and I believe no man living can tell me, whether what we now call *Sunday*, be a *First*, a *Second*, a *Third*, or a *Seventh* day, in a continued Circulation of *Weeks* from the *Creation*. And what it is impossible for me to know, I think will be no Crime to be Ignorant of. Nor hath this Author any other way than common *Tradition*, (on which he is not willing that we should lay weight,) whereby to guess, which is the First, or which is the Seventh day, in such a Circulation of Weeks, either from the *Creation*, or even from *Christ*'s *Time*.

I am sufficiently satisfied that we ought to keep a *Sabbath*, that is, *a day of Holy Rest, after Six days of ordinary Labour*, according to the Fourth Commandment: and this in a continued Course or Circulation: But I am not certain, nor can I be, which

is a First, or a Seventh day in such a Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And therefore shall content my self to observe that day which I find observed in the Church where I live. In *Old England* I observe the Sabbath which here I find; And if I were in *New-England*, I would observe the Sabbath which I find observed there. Though I think it may be disputable whether they and we may be said to observe the same day, (the First Meridian passing between them and us.) And yet I would not advise to have it changed in either.

Now I can hardly think, that God hath laid the great stress of so weighty a Point (as whereon the main of Gods publick Worship doth much depend) on such a Circumstance as is impossible for us to know, and of which we may be modestly ignorant.

I should rather think that what Christ says of the *Place*, *Joh.* 4. 21, 23, *The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this Mountain nor in Jerusalem worship the Father, but the true worshipers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth*, is in good measure true of the *Time* also; And, as it is not so material whether in this or that *Place*, God be Worshiped, so he be *Worshiped Aright*: so neither is it so material, whether on this, or that *day*; as, that a *Sabbath* or day of *Holy Rest* be duly kept. The publick Worship of God, was then in great measure confined to the *Temple*; not indifferently, *in any place within thy Gates*, but in the place *which the Lord thy God shall chuse, to put his name there*, Deut. 16. 6, 11, 15, 16. For which any other place may *now* be as well assigned; that men pray *every where lifting up holy hands*, &c. 1 *Tim.* 2. 8. (Privately in private places, and Publickly in places appointed for the publick.) And I do not think we are now more confined to the *Jewish Sabbath*, than to the *Jewish Temple*.

This premised, I can agree with this Author in many things by him discussed.

I agree, that *Our Lord Jesus Christ* (according to his *Divinity*) was *God* (and is so) the *true God*, the God that *made Heaven and Earth, the God who delivered the Law upon Mount Sinai*. For though we do acknowledge, in the Godhead, a *Trinity of Persons*; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, (whereof Christ according to his Divinity is called the *Second Person*, the *Son of God*, or *God the Son*;) yet those *Three Persons* are but *One God*. Nor do I know any other *true God* but *One*, The *God that made Heaven and Earth*, The *Lord Jehovah*, The *God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, The *Lord God of Israel*, The *Lord their God who brought them out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage*, and besides

whom

whom we are to have no Other God, The God who *delivered the Law to them on Mount Sinai*; And I do agree that *Our Lord Jesus Christ, is* (as to his Divinity) *this* God, the *True* God, the *onely true God*, and that he was so before his Incarnation. How far each of those Actions are to be ascribed to this or that *Person of the Trinity*, we need not be over solicitous. What in the New Testament is more peculiarly ascribed to this or that of the Three Persons, is in the Old Testament wont to be ascribed to *God* indefinitely, without such particular application; the doctrine of the Trinity being then not so distinctly discovered. But I cannot agree that Christ as *God and Man* (in contradistinction to the *Father and Holy Ghost*) did all those things; for he was not then *Man*.

I agree with him also, that God who made the World in *Six* days, *Rested the Seventh day*, Gen. 2. 2, 3. Exod. 20. 11. And that he *Blessed the Sabbath day and Hallowed it*. And that accordingly he hath appointed after *Six* days of ordinary *Labour*, Man should observe a *Seventh* day of *Holy Rest*, and this in a continued succession.

But I should rather say, that *our Lord Jesus Christ is* (according to his Divinity) *that God who Blessed the Seventh day* Gen. 2. than that *the God who Blessed the Sabbath day, is the Lord Jesus Christ*; (as he doth *p.* 64. and elsewhere very often, seeming to lay great stress upon it.) For he was not then the *Lord Christ* (God and Man) nor did he bless it as *Christ*, but as *God*, in Union with the Father and Holy Ghost, not as contradistinguished from them.

I agree also, that the Law of the *Sabbath* is one of the *Decalogue* or *Ten Commandments* delivered to *Israel* on Mount *Sinai*. Ex. 20.

But I am willing to think it was a Law before. Not only because we find it observed, *Exod.* 16. (before the giving of the Law on Mount *Sinai*, Ex. 20.) but especially because of that in *Gen.* 2. 3. *God blessed the Seventh day and Sanctified it, because in it he rested from all his Work*. And those who are most averse to the Morality (as it is wont to be called) or the *Perpetuity* of the *Sabbath*, or *Day of Holy Rest*, and are yet very zealous for the *Holiness of Places*, would be very fond of it if they could find so clear a Testimony, and so ancient, for the holiness of *Place*, as here is for that of *Time*.

I agree also that the Law of the *Decalogue* or *Ten Commandments*, though then given peculiarly to *Israel*, is Obligatory to *Us* also. For though some Clauses therein do peculiarly respect them, as that *who brought thee out of the land of Egypt out of the house*

houſe of bondage, and *that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee*, (which I think is there ſaid with a particular reſpect to the land of *Canaan*, which God *gave* to *Iſrael*, not to us;) yet the Body of that Law and the preceptive part of it, I take to be Obligatory to others alſo, and to Us in particular; the Decalogue being *Declarative* of what was (I think) a *Law before* (however neglected or forgotten,) and is by Chriſt and his Apoſtles frequently cited as ſuch, even to Gentiles as well as Jews.

Nor will I diſpute it with him, whether the *Sabbath* were obſerved *from the Creation to the Floud*. For I am willing to think that if it were not, it ſhould have been; though, in the ſhort Hiſtory that *Moſes* gives us of that time, there be no mention made of ſuch Obſervation. But I doubt it was not *univerſally* ſo obſerved, if at all. For when *all fleſh had corrupted their ways*, I doubt the Sabbath day and the worſhip of that day were by them not much regarded. Nor do I find (*Gen.* 2. 3.) any *expreſs Command* (ſuch as he demands for the *Firſt days* Sabbath) that it ſhould be obſerved thenceforth by Men, *every Seventh day* of the Week *for ever*. How far the words *he bleſſed and ſanctified it* may extend I will not diſpute. It may be a *ſtrong Intimation* (and I think it is,) But it is not expreſly ſaid, that, *All Mankind muſt, for ever after, obſerve every Seventh day, in every Week of days, reckoned continually from the firſt Creation*. Nor do I think it neceſſary to have been ſo recorded by *Moſes*, (any more, than the Law for *Sacrifices*,) if it did otherwiſe appear to have been the Will of God. And therefore I would not have him lay too great a ſtreſs, on what he ſaith, that *there is no expreſs Commandment, Recorded in the New Teſtament, for obſerving the Firſt day*: It is enough if we there find ſufficient Intimation for us to judge that God was pleaſed to have it obſerved.

I ſay the like as to the time from the Floud to that of *Abraham*, and from thence to the coming of *Iſracl* out of *Egypt*. For I do not find any mention of their obſerving a Sabbath (either in the Writings of *Moſes*, or the Book of *Job*) earlier than that of *Exod.* 16. after *Iſraels* coming out of *Egypt*, and after the time that God is ſaid to have *made a ſtatute and ordinance for them, at Marah*, Ex. 15. 25. What that Statute and Ordinance was, we cannot tell. The Jewiſh Writers think (or ſome of them) that it was that of the *Sabbath*; and perhaps it might, or this be ſome part of it. It was perhaps a Revival of what had been before diſuſed. Nor is it likely that their Task-Maſters in *Egypt* would

would ſuffer them to be Idle, and neglect their Work, one whole day in Seven.

Nor do I find any foot-ſteps in Hiſtory that any other Nation but the Jews did (for many Ages after this time) ſo much as meaſure out their time by Weeks.

I know that many Learned and Pious men have been ſearching to that purpoſe and willing to lay hold on any thing that might ſeem to look that way. And I ſhould be well enough pleaſed to ſee it made out. But I have not ſeen any thing convictive to give me ſatisfaction therein.

I have conſulted *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and what he cites in the Fifth Book of his *Stromata*, who hath I believe made the beſt ſearch of any into Heathen Writers for that purpoſe. His deſign in that Book is to ſhew that the Heathens had ſtollen or borrowed much of their *Philoſophy* from what he calls *Philoſophia Barbara*, or *Barbarorum*, meaning thereby the *Jewiſh Learning*; (for, with the *Greeks*, all but themſelves were *Barbarians*.) And amongſt many other things, he takes notice of the number *Seven* ſometimes mentioned in Heathen Writers, as with ſome veneration; which he thinks to be occaſioned from that number oft mentioned in the Sacred Writers, and particularly from that of their *Sabbath*, and meaſuring their time by *Weeks*. But he doth not at all intimate as if himſelf did think the *Heathens* ſo to have divided their time, or to keep that Sabbath, but only that they were acquainted with the Jewiſh Learning, and borrowed much of theirs from thence.

That which therein ſeemed to me the moſt promiſing (and by others alſo is oft alledged) was that Cited from *Heſiod*, ἑβδόμην ἱερὸν ἦμαρ (*the Seventh a Sacred day.*) But when I conſulted the place in *Heſiod*, in his Ἔργα καὶ ἡμέραι, (in the latter part of which he treats of *Days*) I find nothing there of *Weeks*, or *days of the Week*, but only *days of the Month*. For 'tis this he there propoſeth to ſpeak of, τριηκάδα μηνὸς, (*the Thirty days of the Month*,) on which he makes divers Remarks; as, which of them were to be accounted *Good days*, and which *Bad days*, and, for *what purpoſes*. And begins with theſe,

Πρῶτον, ἕνη, τετράδ' τε, καὶ ἑβδόμην, ἱερὸν ἦμαρ,
Τῇ γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορα γείνατο Λητώ.

(*Begin we with the Firſt, and the Fourth, and the Seventh, a Sacred day; Becauſe that on this day* Apollo *who hath the Golden*

Sword

Sword was born of Latona.) So that (it ſeems) the *Seventh* day (not the *Firſt*) was then *Sunday*. (For *Apollo with his Gold Sword*, is but another name for the *Sun*.) But it was the Seventh day of the *Month*, not the Seventh day of the *Week*, (for of *Weeks* he there ſays nothing.) And he then goes on to ſpeak of the *Eighth* and *Ninth* days; then of the *Eleventh* and *Twelfth*, next of the *Thirteenth*, and ſo of other days of the Month; ſhewing which of them were accounted *Lucky* days, and which *Unlucky*, and *for what Affairs*. But nothing of Weeks at all.

However, *Heſiod* himſelf, though one of the Oldeſt of the Heathen Writers, is but young as to the times we ſpeak of; who is reckoned to have lived about the time of King *Uzziah*, Seven Hundred years after the time we are now conſidering, upon the coming of *Iſrael* out of *Egypt*. Nor doth *Clemens Alexandrinus* think, when they name *Seven*, it was from any *Old Tradition* (from *Adam* or *Noah*) but from what acquaintance they then had with the Jewiſh Writers of later time.

Nor do I find any thing that is more to the purpoſe, in all there Cited by *Clemens Alexandrinus* than this of *Heſiod*. But if any where he could have found, that the *Heathens divided their Time by Weeks*; no doubt but he would have mentioned this as *borrowed from the Jewiſh Learning*; (which was the thing he was there inquiring after.) And, when he ſaith nothing of it, we may be ſure he could not find it. I find indeed that ſome of the Heathens (as *Juvenal* and *Lucian*) do laugh or jeer at the Jewiſh Sabbath (*recutitaque Sabbata pallent*) and therefore did *know* of the Jewiſh Sabbath; But not that they did obſerve it, or ſo much as divide their Time by Weeks.

Now if we ſhould admit, that in ſome Families (where the true Worſhip of God was preſerved) there be a ſtrong preſumption (for 'tis no more) that they did obſerve a *Sabbath*; that is, *a Seventh day of Holy Reſt after Six days of ordinary Labour*; yet 'tis a queſtion, whether that were juſt the Seventh day in a continual ſucceſſion of Weeks from the Creation.

And if at any time there chance to be an intermiſſion, and the day forgotten, it is impoſſible (without a Miracle or a new Revelation) that it can be reſtored again. And if from thenceforth they would again keep a Sabbath (as we find the Paſs-over was revived by *Hezekiah* and *Joſiah* which had been long intermitted 2 *Kings* 23. and 2 *Chr.* 25.) they muſt begin at adventure, and thence continue it.

Now if we conſider, that the true Worſhip of God was oft reduced

duced to ſome one family, as in the time of *Noah*, and perhaps of *Abraham*; and even that Family ſometimes corrupt enough, (as was that of *Nahor*, from whence *Abraham* for that reaſon was removed; and that of *Laban* where *Jacob* ſojourned; and how oft alſo the like happened, we cannot tell) It was very poſſible the *Sabbath* might be neglected; as himſelf obſerves *p.* 63, it had been *before and under the Captivity for a long time*, and made *a Market-day*, as well as any other day of the Week; like as the *Temple* was become a *Market-place*, *Mat.* 21. 12, 13. *Joh.* 2. 14. 16. As was alſo the Paſs-over in great meaſure from the time of *Samuel* till that of *Joſiah*, 2 *Chr.* 35. 18. And the Feaſt of *Tabernacles*, from the days of *Joſhuah* to *Nehemiah*, Neh. 8. 17. And Circumciſion, for Forty years together in the Wilderneſs, *Joſh.* 5. 5.

Now if *Circumciſion* and the *Paſs-over* and the Feaſt of *Tabernacles* were thus neglected when they were *at Liberty*; how much more the *Sabbath*, when they were *Bond-men* in *Egypt*; of which we have not the leaſt mention from God's keeping a Sabbath, *Gen.* 2. 3. till after Iſraels coming out of *Egypt*, *Exod.* 16.

Nor is there the leaſt mention (as I ſhew'd but now) in any Hiſtory Sacred or Profane, ſo much as of dividing their time by *Weeks*, all that time; nor, except that of Iſrael, for many Ages after.

And though the *Sun*, *Moon and Stars* (*Gen.* 1. 14.) are ſaid to be *for Signs and for Seaſons*, *for Days and for Years*, yet not a word is there of *Weeks*. Nor could they indeed, by their Motions, diſtinguiſh *Weeks*, as they do *Months* and *Years*. And therefore though I find *Years* and *Months* to have been obſerved all the World over long ago; yet *Weeks* no where (that I know) of ancient times, but by the Nation of the *Jews* onely, nor by them before their coming out of *Egypt*.

So that, though, I am willing to think, the Sabbath *ought* to have been obſerved all that while, yet there is too much reaſon to doubt it *was not*; or, if at all, not without frequent intermiſſions, which would, in this caſe, be fatal.

Now to argue as he doth, that *Abel*, and *Enoch*, and *Noah*, and *Abraham*, were *good men*, and are (ſome of them) ſaid to *walk with God*, and to *keep his Commandments*, and therefore may be preſumed to have *kept a Sabbath*, is but a weak argument as to matter of *Fact*, and, to *begg the Queſtion*. For we are not to think them *ſo good* as to be guilty of no *failings* or *omiſſions*.

The Law of *Marriage* is certainly as Old, if not Older than that of the *Sabbath*, the tenour of which was (he tells us *p.* 62.) that *they Two ſhould be one fleſh*; *not*, *they Three*, *Four* or *Five*: yet he

he tells us alſo, that *Polygamy, or having many Wives, was frequently practiſed, from Lamech to Malachi, even by ſome eminent in the Church at that time, and by them (he ſuppoſeth) held to be lawful.* And it may as well be thought, the Law for the *Sabbath* might ſometime within that *Two Thouſand Five Hundred Years*) be neglected and forgotten; as that of *Marriage*; In a time when there was no writing (that we know of) to preſerve it. And, if once forgotten, it could never (as to *that* Seventh day) be recovered.

And I would ask that Gentleman, In caſe the day ſhould chance to have been ſometime forgotten, (as is very poſſible and not unlikely,) and that after ſuch time (upon finding *the Book of the Law*, as in *Joſiah*'s time 2 *Kings* 22. 8. which had been loſt) it did appear that a *Sabbath ſhould have been kept*, but was not, (as was there the caſe of the *Paſs-over*, *Chap.* 23. 21.) What doth this Gentleman think (in ſuch caſe) ſhould be done? Muſt they *never Reſtore the Sabbath* becauſe they do not know the day? Or muſt they begin upon a *New Account*? I ſhould think this latter; (and that it would be warranted by the *Fourth Commandment*;) notwithſtanding his Objection, No *other day* (but the Seventh from the Creation) *is Commanded*; No *Promiſe* to the Obſervance of *any other*; nor *Threatning* for the Omiſſion.

Indeed in our days when ſo great a part of the World reckon by *Weeks*, and we be ſtored with Aſtronomical Tables adjuſted to the Motions of the Sun, Moon and Stars, and many Celeſtial Obſervations, (as for Inſtance, that ſuch a Year, ſuch a Day of ſuch a Month there was an Eclipſe on Monday morning or the like) 'twere more eaſy to rectify ſuch an intermiſſion. But in thoſe days, when there was nothing of all this, nor ſo much as the uſe of Writing (that we know of) older than *Moſes*; There was no way to rectify an interrupted Tradition.

All which is not ſaid to diſparage the Obſervation of the Sabbath day (for which I have as great Veneration as he that pleads for the *Saturday* Sabbath,) But onely to ſhew, that we can be at no Certainty, (and ſcarce a Conjecture,) which is the Firſt, Second, or Seventh day of the Week in a continued Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And conſequently I cannot think that the great ſtreſs of the Fourth Commandment is to be underſtood of juſt *that* Seventh day in every ſuch Week from the Creation (which I doubt cannot be known) But rather that there ſhould be a Weekly Sabbath; that is, after Six days of Work, the Seventh ſhould be a Holy Reſt, and then, after another Six days of Work, the Seventh ſhould be again a Holy Reſt; and ſo continu-

tinually; which is as truly observed in the Sunday-Sabbath, as in that of Saturday.

As when God requires *the Tenth* of our *Increase*; it is not meant of the Tenth *in Order* (for it should rather be the First in Order, for he requires the *First-fruits*) but the Tenth in *Proportion*; So here the *Seventh*.

And this Author knows very well, that it is signally noted by Expositors on the Fourth Commandment, and other Writers about the Sabbath, That this Commandment begins with *Remember to keep Holy the Sabbath-day*, or the day of Rest, (not the *Seventh day*; much less the Seventh day of the Week *from the first Creation*;) And what is that day of Rest, the next Words tell us, *Six days shalt thou labour, but the Seventh is the Sabbath, &c.* That is, after Six days of Labour, the Seventh shall be a day of Rest. And in the close of that Commandment (*Ex.* 20. 11.) our Bibles have it *wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day* (not as we commonly repeat it, the *Seventh* day) *and hallowed it*. The Reason given to inforce it is, *For in Six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth &c. and rested the Seventh day*, and accordingly should we, after Six days of Work have a Seventh day of Rest, and so onward.

If he thinks that to make a difference, that we now reckon our Weeks to begin with the day of Rest, and after that, Six Working days (which in a continued Circulation comes all to one,) I will allow that Gentleman (if that will please him better) to begin the Week on *Monday*, and then Sunday will be the *Seventh*. The Commandment says nothing of the *Seventh* day of the Week in a continued Succession *from the Creation*; but *the Seventh day* after *Six days of Labour*.

And whereas he observes (and would lay great weight upon it) that it is (*hashebigni*) *the Seventh* (the article *ha* answering to our *the*) not *a Seventh*. 'Tis very true, and very proper so to be. For the meaning is not that, after *Six* days of Labour, there should be a *Seventh* for Rest *no matter when*; but *the Seventh* day, that is, *the next* day after those Six. But it is not said *the Seventh in Course from the Creation*. Just as when it is said, a Male-Child is to be Circumcised *the Eighth day*, it is not meant of an Eighth day in Course from the *Creation*; but *the Eighth day* from *the Birth*. And in like manner *Ex.* 12. 16. *In the Seventh day there shall be a Holy Convocation*; it is not meant of the *Seventh day of the Week* from the Creation; but on the Seventh day of the *Feast of unleavened Bread*, what ever day of the Week that happen to be. And

Exod. 16. 5, 25. The *Sixth* and *Seventh* day there mentioned, ſeem plainly to be, not the Sixth and Seventh in courſe *from the Creation* (which I doubt was not then known) but from the *firſt raining of Manna*, ver. 4, 5.

He'll ſay perhaps, The Jews obſerved ſuch *Seventh* day from the *Creation*, and that was their *Sabbath*. But that is more than he or I know, or any man living. They had I grant, a Circulation of *Seven days*, but from what *Epocha* we cannot tell. And when *Moſes* tells them (on the *Sixth* day) *Ex.* 16. 23. *To morrow is the Reſt of the Holy Sabbath.* It ſeems to be the fixing of a new *Epocha* (from the firſt raining of *Manna*) and then all his Arguments, from the continual Obſervation of the Seventh day from the Creation till that time, are at an end. Whether this (from the firſt raining of *Manna*) be the ſame with that from the Creation; no man can tell. And there is *Six to One* odds that it is not.

Now, that there is a new Courſe of Sabbath (from a new beginning) whereof this Seventh day from the firſt raining of Manna is the Firſt, and not a continuation of a former Courſe hitherto obſerved without interruption; ſeems farther evident from this conſideration, Becauſe, if this were but a continuation of that uninterrupted Courſe of Sabbaths, then the next Seventh day before it, would have been a Sabbath alſo, and to have been in like manner obſerved; that is, the next day before the firſt raining of *Manna*. But, on that day we find (*Exod.* 16, 12, 13.) *the Quails came up and covered the Camp*, without any Prohibition to gather them. If therefore they might not (now) gather *Manna*, becauſe it was the *Sabbath*; but *might* (before) gather *Quails*; it ſhould ſeem, that was *not* a *Sabbath*.

And if it be not allowed, upon occaſion, to fix a new *Epocha*; then if the Circulation of Weeks from the beginning of the World (which was then about 2500 years old) did ever chance to have been interrupted, and the day forgotten, (as an all likelyhood it might be in *Egypt*, if not long before) or if ever after it ſhould chance ſo to be (as in the days of *Joſiah* when *the Book of the Law* was loſt, and the *Paſs-over* forgotten;) men muſt never keep a Sabbath thenceforth. For then all his own Arguments return upon him; No *other* day is *Commanded* ('tis Will-worſhip,) no *Promiſe* to the Obſervance, no *Threatning* for the Neglect.

I ſhould rather think, if that day were unknown (as I believe it is) *Any* day were better than *None* at all. For Gods Commands do more reſpect the Subſtance of the Duty than the Circumſtance

ſtance of Time, eſpecially if they cannot both be had.

Circumciſion was to be Adminiſtred on the *Eighth* day, according to the Inſtitution, (I do not mean the *Eighth day of the Week*, but the *Eighth day of the Child's Age*; and therefore on the ſame day of the Week on which the Child was Born.) But if by Accident or Default it were omitted, it might be done any day after, rather than not at all. *Abraham* we know was 99 years old, and *Iſmael* 13 when they were Circumciſed, (and what was the Age of other Males in *Abraham's* Family, we cannot tell;) and a Proſelyte, at any Age, was to be Circumciſed; (though perhaps it were not remembred on what day of the Week he was Born;) and thoſe who were born in the Wilderneſs for Forty years together, were all Circumciſed at once, *Joſh.* 5. 4, 5, 9. (though not all born on the ſame day of the Week.)

The Paſs-over was appointed to be eaten ſtanding, with their Loyns girt, their Shoes on their feet, and their Staffs in their hand, as in haſt to be gone *Ex.* 12. Yet our Saviour ſeemeth to have Eaten it Sitting, or rather Lying. And *none of them were to ſtir out of doors till morning*, Ex. 12. 22. Yet Chriſt and his Diſciples went out the ſame night to *the mount of Olives*, and thence to *Gethſemane*, Mat. 26. 30, 36.

The Shew-bread was to be eaten by the Prieſts only: yet our Saviour obſerves that *David* did eat of it (on a ſpecial occaſion) without blaming him for ſo doing.

The *Rechabites* are commended *Jer.* 35. for obeying the Command of *Jonathan* their Father, *not to drink Wine, nor build Houſes, but to dwell in Tents* &c. Yet did they, upon *Nebuchadnezzar's* Invaſion, quit their *Tents* and repair to *Jeruſalem*; not is it reputed a Diſobedience.

The *Paſchal Lamb* was to be kill'd the *Fourteenth day of the Firſt Month at Evening*; Yet if we conſider how little knowledge they had in thoſe days, of the Sun and Moons motions, and if we conſider what the Jewiſh Writers tell us of their very uncertain Method of judging, which was the *Firſt Month*, and which the *Fourteenth day* of that Month we ſhall find they were at great uncertainties, as to the juſt day; yet was not the Service thereof to be neglected, upon pretenſe there was danger of miſſing the right day.

For they had not Almanacks in thoſe days, as we have now, to tell us before hand when will be a New Moon. But (if we may believe the Jewiſh Writers) their manner was, about the time when they expected a New-Moon, to ſend men to watch for it on

the Top of some Hill or high Place; and he who could first discover a New-Moon, was to tell the Priest, and he to *blow the Trumpet* to give the People notice that there was a New-Moon, much like our Custom at *Oxford*, at the time of the *Assizes*, to set some on St. *Maries* Steeple to watch when the Judges are coming, and then to Ring the *Great Bell* to give notice to those concerned, that the Judges are at hand;) But, in case of Cloudy Weather, if in three days time from their first Expectation no man could see a New Moon, they did then venture (but not before) to blow the Trumpet without seeing it, which must needs cause a great uncertainty; and the same Moon sooner seen at one place than at another, and the Pass-over kept accordingly. And tis manifest in the Story of our Saviours last Pass-over, that he kept it on one day and the Jews on another (perhaps he about a Fortnight before, might see a New-Moon, a day sooner than they did.) So great uncertainty there was at that time, as to the particular day, though the Institution was punctual for the *Fourteenth* day of the *First* Month. And the like uncertainty there was as to all their *Feasts* of *New-Moons*.

And even in our days, when the Motions of the Sun and Moon are much better known than at that time they were, we are far from being exact in point of time. Our Rule for *Easter* is much the same with theirs for the *Pass-over*; The Rule in general is this, *The Sunday next after the Fourteenth day of the First Month, is to be Easter day.* But when we come to make particular application, we do strangely miss of our Rule. And our Paschal Tables which should direct us, do put us farther out than if we had none at all.

For (by reason that we take the length of our common year a little too long, by about Eleven minutes of an hour, and the length of our Months too long also;) since the time that those Tables were made, 'tis well known that the beginning of our Ecclesiastical First Month, is Ten or Eleven days later than that of the Heavens; and our Ecclesiastical New-Moons and Full-Moons, is later by Four or Five days than those of the Heavens. Whereby we do very often mistake the *Month*, and yet oftner the true *Week*, for keeping of *Easter*. And though Pope *Gregory* the Eighth, did (somewhat more than an Hundred years ago) somewhat rectify the Calendar, yet both Papists and Protestants do observe, some the Newer *Gregorian*, and some the Older *Julian* account, and (in the United Proviuces of the *Netherlands*) one Town observes one account, and the next the other account,

and

and accordingly keep their Eaſters (if at all) at Three, Four or Five Weeks diſtance,

And ſo for Chriſtmas-day. 'Tis not agreed amongſt Chronologers either what Year, or what Month, much leſs what day of that Month, our Saviour was born, yet wee keep *December 25th.* in memory of his Birth, as ſuppoſing him to have been then born. Yea we are at ſo great uncertainty, that we reckon the year 1692 from his *Circumciſion*, to begin the Firſt of *January*; but the ſame year as from his *Conception*, not till the *25th* of *March* next following; as if his Birth and Circumciſion had been a quarter of a year before his Conception.

And if we be now at ſo great an uncertainty, in ſo ſhort a Period as from the Birth of Chriſt, I do not think the Jews could be punctual, as to a day, in obſerving their Paſſ-over; and much leſs, as to a day from the Creation of the World.

He'l ſay perhaps, that Eaſter and Chriſtmas being of humane Inſtitution, it is not much matter though we miſs the day, nor much matter perhaps whether it be kept or no. Be it ſo; But the Paſs-over was of Divine Inſtitution; yet were they at a great uncertainty, and might chance to miſs more than a day or two; yet was not the Duty to be therefore neglected. The miſtake of a Day, was of much leſs concernment than the neglect of the Duty; As was the *Tithing of Mint and Anniſe*, than *the weightier things of the Law.* Theſe little Circumſtances are but *Shaddows*, in compariſon of the *Subſtance*, as the Compariſon is *Col.* 2. 17.

Which is not ſaid to incourage any one to violate the Laws of God, even in little things, (for we find God ſometimes very ſevere even in ſuch; as in the Caſe of *Uzzah's touching the Ark*, and *Nadab and Abihu's offering ſtrange Fire*; for Reaſons beſt known to himſelf, of which we are not aware.) But onely to ſhew that the Subſtantials of a Duty are to be regarded more than Circumſtantials; and theſe upon occaſion to give way to thoſe. And in ſuch Caſes (if it were a fault) the Prayer of *Hezekiah* (2 *Chr.* 30. 18.) is to take place, *The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to ſeek God, though he be not cleanſed according to the Purification of the Sanctuary.* And his Service was accepted, though (as it is expreſly noted) *they did eat the Paſſ-over otherwiſe than as it was written:* And, *in the Second Month*, inſtead of the *Firſt.*

And doubtleſs in the preſent caſe, If we do not know (as certainly we do not) which is the *Firſt* or *Seventh* day in a continual Circu-

Circulation from the Creation, it is much better to keep a Weekly Sabbath on any day of the Week whatever, than to keep none at all, and much more agreable to the true meaning of the Fourth Commandment.

All which is said, partly by way of Caution, not to be forward, upon slight grounds, to disturb the Peace and settled practise of the whole Christian Church at this day.

Partly to take off what he would have to be admitted but cannot be proved, that the Seventh day in a continued Circulation of Weeks from the first Creation, was observed as the Weekly Sabbath, from the Creation to the Floud; from thence to *Abraham*; from thence to *Israels* coming out of *Egypt*; and from thence till after the Resurrection of Christ. Which I think is impossible for any man to know.

And partly to satisfy what he objects from the Fourth Commandment. Which saith indeed that there is to be a *Rest* on the *Seventh day after Six days of Labour*, but not a Word of its being such Seventh day, in a continual Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And therefore we are safe hitherto, for ought I see.

But I'le come up a little nearer to him. He may perhaps tell us (though I do not find he doth) that the Jews did certainly keep their Weekly Sabbath (at the time of our Saviours death) on what *they* called *the Seventh day*. If not on the Seventh day of the Week from the Creation (of which we can have no certainty) at least on the Seventh day of the Week, as the Weeks were *then* reckoned; (which I readily grant him) and that they had so done for a long time before, and perhaps from the time of giving the Law on Mount *Sinai*. (And it may be so, for ought I know, but we cannot be certain.) And what was then called *the First day of the Week*, was another day from what they called *the Seventh* (which I admit also.) And that, what they called *the Seventh day*, is now what we call *Saturday*, and what they called the *First day* is what we now call *Sunday*. But this, I say, is more than he or I know. He may think so; and so do I; but I am not sure of it.

The reason why I think so, is, because I think that Christ or his Apostles (according to Christs direction) did remove the observation of the Sabbath, from the Seventh to the First day of the Week, and that we have ever since kept the Sabbath as they did, (for I do not know that it hath been since altered,) and as we now keep it on Sunday, so I believe they did; and therefore think that our Sunday is what they called the First day.

And

And if the Apoſtles did then remove it from their Seventh day to their Firſt day, I preſume they had direction from Chriſt ſo to do, who after his Reſurrection, *ſhewed himſelf to them for Fourty days, giving Commandments to his Apoſtles ſpeaking to them of things pertaining to the Kingdom of God*, Acts 1. 2, 3. And therefore, what they did afterwards in ſettling the Chriſtian Church, they did (we are to preſume) according to ſuch Directions and Commandments of Chriſt, and this in particular of ſo removing the Obſervation of the Sabbath day, if they did remove it, (as I think was done) by his Authority who was *Lord of the Sabbath day*. Matth. 12. 8. Luk. 6. 5.

But if they did not ſo remove it; I do not know that it hath ſince been changed. For I think we keep the ſame Sabbath which they did: and that the Chriſtian Church hath ever ſince ſo done; and doth pretend ſo to have done, by a conſtant Tradition ever ſince. And we therefore think our Sunday to be their Firſt day of the Week, becauſe we think their Sabbath ſo to have been. But if we miſtake in that Tradition, we are (for ought I know) accordingly miſtaken in thinking Sunday to be their Firſt day; (For we have nothing but Tradition for either.) And then for ought he can ſhew (by better than Tradition) to the Contrary, our Sunday may be their Seventh day. And then he hath no pretenſe to quarel with it.

If he ſay the Jews do at this day keep Saturday as their Seventh day. I confeſs they do. But they do no more know which is the Seventh day; than we, which is the Firſt day. And becauſe they find that Chriſtians generally take Sunday to be what was before called the Firſt day, they do accordingly take Saturday to be their Seventh day. But their Tradition is of no greater Authority than ours. All depending upon this, that our Sunday being that Sabbath which we think Chriſt or his Appoſtles did appoint, we take it to be the Firſt day, becauſe Chriſt or his Apoſtles (by Chriſts directions) did remove the obſervation of the Sabbath to that day.

He'l ſay perhaps; I do not my ſelf think our Sunday to be their Seventh day. And then, why ſhould not our Sabbath be on Saturday as theirs was?

'Tis true, I do not think our Sunday to be their Seventh day. And I have told you the reaſon why I do not think it; Becauſe I think Chriſt or his Apoſtles did change the day, and for that reaſon only. And for the ſame reaſon I think our Sabbath ſhould be as now it is, and as I think it hath been ever ſince. But if I be miſtaken

miſtaken in it, I may be miſtaken in the other alſo: But, either way, Sunday is yet to be our Sabbath.

He ſays, It is no where *expreſly ſaid in Scripture*, that the Apoſtles did thus change it. True, and 'tis no where ſaid in Scripture, that our Sunday is not their Seventh day. It may be the ſame for ought I know, (and for ought he knows) if it were not then changed. Though, becauſe I think the day was then changed, I do therefore think it is not the ſame. And if it were not changed, then all the difference is, that what they called the Seventh day of their Week, we call the Firſt day of our Week. Which, if the Author do not like, he may call Monday the Firſt day, and then Sunday will be the Seventh, as it was before.

But I ſay further; There be many things, even as to the Worſhip of God, which we may reaſonably think to have *been done*, though it be not *expreſly ſaid ſo*; but only to be collected by conſequence from what is ſaid.

'Tis no where ſaid expreſly, that, after the Firſt Sabbath of God himſelf, (*Gen.* 2. 2.) any other Sabbath was ever kept before that in *Exod.* 16. which was above Two Thouſand and Five Hundred Years after. Yet this Author would have us think it was *obſerved* all that while; and that it was *commanded* ſo to be, which yet is no where ſaid expreſly. But a ſlight preſumption, it ſeems, may ſerve his turn, but not ours.

'Tis known that God was Worſhiped by *Sacrifices* very early; at leaſt as early, as that of *Cain* and *Abel*; and that this Worſhip was accepted of God, at leaſt that of *Abel*. And therefore I ſuppoſe this Author would have us think it was *Commanded*, (not a meer *Will-worſhip*, without any Direction or Inſtitution from God.) Yet we are no where told, of any ſuch Command or Inſtitution.

We may ſay the like of *Jacob*'s conſecrating a *Pillar*, by *pouring Oyl* upon it, *Gen.* 28. 18. though we do not find mention, before that time, of any direction for any ſuch *Conſecration* (of things or perſons) by *Anointing*, or *Pouring on of Oyl*.

We have alſo reaſon to think there was ſome Command from God, that the Fire for *Incenſe* ſhould be taken from the *Altar*, (or ſomewhat of like nature;) elſe *Nadab* and *Abihu* would not have been deſtroyed for *Offering ſtrange Fire*. Yet we are no where told expreſly of any ſuch Command.

We have no particular Command (that I know of) for Baptizing of Infants, nor any particular mention in Scripture of any ſuch Baptized. Yet I do not know that this Author would have

have us thence infer, that none such were baptized, or that they ought not so to be.

Nor have we any express mention of *Womens* receiving the other Sacrament; nor any express Command for their so doing (any more than for Females being Circumcised) yet I know not any who doth therefore think they ought not.

We know that Children were reputed Members of the Church of God before Christ's coming; and we have no reason to think that Christ did put them out (and make them in a worse condition than they were before) but rather would have them continue so to be; and seems to favour it, by that of *suffer little Children to come to me and forbid them not; for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven* Mar. 10. 14. and did accordingly *embrace them* as such. And therefore, as (*before*) they were *Circumcised*, (which was *then* the Sacrament of Admission;) So they should (*now*) be *Baptized* which is *our* Sacrament of Admission.) And when we find whole *Families* to be Baptized, we cannot think but that there might be *little Children* in some of them; (and more likely so than otherwise,) And we are, in such cases, to practise according to what we may judge by what we find. We find also that *Women* were *Baptized* (though not *Circumcised* in the Jewish Church,) yet we have no *Command* for so doing. And because there seems to be the same reason for *Womens* receiving the other Sacrament as for *Men*, (and we find nothing to the contrary,) therefore we do now practise it (as the most likely to be God's Will, according to the Light we now have) though we find in Scripture neither express Precept nor Example for it.

In like manner it is no Argument that Christ or his Apostles did not make such a change, because *in Scripture* it is not *expressly* said so. 'Tis enough if we there find so much as that we may thence reasonably Judge they did so; and more likely so than not. Now I meet with so much there to that purpose, as makes me judge they did. And so much as (I believe) would make this Gentleman so to think, if he were not otherwise prepossessed with prejudice; and with a great fondness to find out somewhat wherewith to find fault.

I find that Christ, on the very day of his Resurrection (which was the *First day of their Week*) did not only appear to the good *Women* at the Sepulchre (who sought him there) and declare to them the *Resurrection* (which was then to *Preach* a new Doctrine, of which they were not before aware) and *bid them* tell it to his Disciples: But did also the same day himself declare it to

Two of them going to *Emmaus* (*Luk.* 24.) *Preaching* to them, from *Moſes and the Prophets* ver. 25, 26, 27. the Doctrine of his *Death and Reſurrection* (which was to them a new Doctrine, which till then they did not underſtand,) or (as the Phraſe there is) did *Expound to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himſelf* ver. 27. which I think, was *Preaching*; and did *open to them the Scriptures* (ver. 31.) concerning thoſe points; (which was a Sabbath-days exerciſe, though perhaps they did not at firſt ſo apprehend it) and did, I take it, celebrate with them the Sacrament of the *Lords Supper*; and perhaps the firſt time after the firſt Inſtitution; for ſo much ſeems to be implyed in thoſe words, (ver. 30.) *he took bread and bleſſed it, and brake, and gave to them*, and (ver. 35.) *he was known to them by breaking of Bread*, (for that Sacrament uſed to be deſigned by *breaking of Bread*.) And if our Author could but ſhew ſo much as this, once done, in the firſt 2500 years from the Creation, on the Seventh day, it would be a better proof for the Celebration of the *Seventh-day Sabbath* in that time, than all that he offers at to that purpoſe. And the *Effect* of this *Preaching* was on them ſo much, that *their eyes were opened, and their heart did burn within them, while he talked with them by the way, and opened to them the Scriptures*, ver. 31, 32. and they returned preſently (the ſame hour) to *Jeruſalem*, to acquaint the Diſciples (who were there aſſembled) with this good news.

If he tell us, that this Journey from *Jeruſalem* to *Emmaus* (being about *Threeſcore Furlongs*, near Eight of our Miles) and back again, was more than a *Sabbath-days Journey*; I confeſs it was (unleſs upon an urgent occaſion) if they had known it to be a *Sabbath-day*, when they *undertook the Journey*; but this then they knew not; nor was it therefore, on this occaſion, a breach of the Sabbath ſo to do.

If he ſay, *Chriſt* knew it (though they did not) if it were now a Sabbath. 'Tis true; he did ſo. But Chriſt, I preſume, in that eſtate (after his Reſurrection) could *Travel* without *Pain*, and therefore without breaking the Sabbath. Or if it were painful; he tells us *Mat.* 12. 5, *that the Prieſts in the Temple profane the Sabbath and are blameleſs*; that is, they take as much pains or labour in killing, dreſſing, and offering the Sacrifices, as a Butcher would do in killing and dreſſing his meat; which would in the Butcher be a culpable Profanation of the Sabbath; but is not ſo in the Prieſts, becauſe theirs is *Religious Service*. Nor doth this Author think that in *Preaching*, though it be a *Labour*, the Miniſter doth thereby break the Sabbath. And ſuch was Chriſts

im-

imployment here. And, then, whether he Preach Standing, or Preach Walking, 'tis all one.

And if he say farther, that the Disciples at *Jerusalem* (not then knowing this) could not be thought then to have met upon a *Sabbatical* account: I grant this also, that their then meeting was Providential (as was that of the Two other meeting Christ in their Journey,) yet they might before they parted (as did those others) know more of it than at their first coming together. And Christ knew before what he meant to do, though they did not, and did accordingly so order it by his Providence. And though they did not know that it was thenceforth to be kept as a *Sabbath*, yet may they well be supposed to be imployed on *Religious Work*, upon what Tidings the *Women* had before brought them (of Christs being *Risen*) waiting for what directions they should farther receive from Christ.

To this purpose let us consider what was further done at this meeting. While these Two were telling the rest what had happened to them; *As they thus spake* (ver. 36.) *Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and said Peace be unto you.* And did (*by shewing them his hands, and feet*, and their *handling of them*, and seeing him *eat before them*) convince them that he was *indeed Risen from the Dead*, and that it was not only a *Spirit* that appeared to them (*ver.* 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42.) And did again, to them, *Preach* the same Doctrine which he had before preached to the Two; That it was what *he had told them while he was yet with them* (though they did not understand it,) That this was but *what was written in the Law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms concerning him*; and *opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures*; That it *was thus written, that it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the Third day, and that Repentance and Remission of Sins was to be Preached in his Name among all Nations*; *whereof they were to be his Witnesses*, and *Apostles* (ver. 44, 45, 46, 47, 48.) And did renew his *Promise* of sending the *Holy Ghost*, and *Power from on high* (v. 49.) He did moreover at the same meeting, not only *upbraid them for their unbelief* (Mark 16. 14.) but did Authorize them with a solemn *Commission* for the Work they were to be sent about, *to Go into all the World, and Preach the Gospel to every Creature; that he who believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he who believeth not shall be damned*; (ver. 15, 16.) and a Power to work *Miracles* (ver. 17, 18.) in confirmation of that Doctrine.

And to the same purpose, *John* 20. 19. *The same day at Evening*

(in which he before appeared to *Mary Magdalen* and the reſt) *being the Firſt day of the Week* (the very day of his Reſurrection) *where the Diſciples were aſſembled* (at a private meeting) *for fear of the Jews* (*the door being ſhut*) *Jeſus came and ſtood in the midſt of them*, and gave them his Solemn Benediction, *ſaying unto them, Peace be unto you;* And in Confirmation of his Reſurrection, *ſhewed them his hands and his ſide*; (ver. 20.) And then a *Second* time gives them his Solemn *Bleſſing* together with his *Ordination* or *Commiſſion* for Preaching the Goſpel, and Planting the Chriſtian Church, *Jeſus ſaith to them Again, Peace be unto you; As my Father hath ſent me, even ſo ſend I you. And when he had ſaid this, he breathed upon them and ſaid unto them, Receive the Holy Ghoſt: Whoſoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted to them; and whoſoever Sins ye retain, they are retained*, ver. 21, 22, 23.

All which being put together, ſeems to me very like the *Celebration* (if not the *Conſecration*) of a Chriſtian *Sabbath*, or day of *Holy Reſt* and Religious Service. 'Tis all of it *Sabbatical Work*, and there is a great deal of it.

'Tis not indeed *expreſly ſaid*, That he did *bid* them thus to meet on ſuch other *Firſt day* of the Week, (as neither is it expreſly ſaid, *Gen.* 2. 3. that God did then *bid Adam* and *Eve* to keep a Weekly *Sabbath*, or that he did *bid* them to offer *Sacrifice*;) but it is very likely Chriſt might ſo order it (and more likely than that he did not.) For, that they did ſo meet we are ſure; and therefore 'tis very likely (if not a ſtrong preſumption) that they were *bid* ſo to do. For ſo we find it *Joh.* 20. 26. *After Eight days* (that is, as we commonly ſpeak in Engliſh, *on that day Sennight*) *his Diſciples were again within, and* Thomas *with them* (who before was abſent) *the door being ſhut; then Jeſus came and ſtood in the midſt and ſaid Peace be unto you*, (as he had done the Week before,) and ſatisfyed *Thomas*, who before doubted.

So that we have here Two Solemn meetings of the Diſciples, Two Weeks together (the Two firſt after his Reſurrection) on the *Firſt day of the Week*; and Chriſt with them on both. (And I am ſure we have not more for the Firſt Sabbath, *Gen.* 2. 3.) On how many more ſuch Sabbaths he ſo met with them, I cannot tell. That he oft appeared to them (during the Forty days of his abode on Earth after his Reſurrection) we cannot doubt, and its like it might be on theſe days.

The Cavil which here he makes to this place, is ſo weak, that I am ſorry to ſee it from one who would ſeem to be ſerious. As if *Eight days after*, or *after Eight days*, were not the ſame as what we

we would say *a Week after* or that day *Sennight after*; For he must needs know, that 'tis not only the Common Scripture Language, but the general Language of Latine and Greek Writers, to reckon *Inclusively*, that is, to take in both the extreams; and so it is even at this day (I think) in most Languages except English. What we call a *Sennight*, the French call *huict jours* (Eight days) and what we say a *Fortnight*, is with them *Quinze jours* (Fifteen days;) and so in all manner of reckoning. A *Fourth*, a *Fifth*, an *Eighth*, a *Fifteenth*, and other *Intervals* in *Musick* are always so reckoned. What we call a *Third-day-Ague*, the Latins call a *Quartan*, and what we call *every other day*, they call a *Tertian*. So they call *Secundo Calendas* (i. e. *Secundo die ante Calendas*) what we would say *one day* (not *two days*) *before the Calends*; and they call *tertio Calendas*, what is with us *two days* (not *three days*) *before the Calends*. So *nudius tertius* is what we would say *two days ago*; and *nudius quartus* is in our Language *Three days ago* (not *Four*.) So *Mark* 8. 31. where Christ speaks of himself, that *the Son of Man should be killed and After three days rise again*, that is, *on the Third day after* (inclusively taken) or *after the Third day is come*; whereas, according to the sense this Author would put upon the words, it should rather have been said *after one day* (for there was but *one* day *between* his Death and Resurrection;) And it is the same in sense, with what he says *Joh.* 2. 19. *Destroy this Temple*, (speaking of his Body) *And in Three days I will raise it up*, ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, or as *Mat.* 26. 61. διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν, that is, *the Third day after* (inclusively.) And *Mat.* 27. 63. they tell *Pilate*, *This Deceiver said*, *After Three days I will rise again*, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας (meaning thereby *the Third day after*, *inclusively*) and therefore they pray, that the Sepulchre may be made sure *till the Third day*. Whereas, if (as our Author would reckon *upon his fingers*) by *after Three days*, were to be understood, when *Three whole days* after that should be past, they need not set their Watch before the *Fourth* or *Fifth* day. Thus Christ's *Ascension* is said to be *Forty* days after his *Resurrection*, (speaking of a Scripture Computation, in Scripture Language,) which in our ordinary manner of Speech is but *Nine and Thirty*. For *Ascension-Thursday* (if *Easter day* be not reckoned for one) is but 39 days *after* Easter. Upon a like Account that Christ tells us *Mat.* 12. 40. that *as Jonas was three days and three nights in the Whales Belly*, *so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the Earth*. Not Three *whole days*, and Three *whole nights*; but, till *the Third* was begun. For by

day

day and night is here understood the νυχθημερον, or what we now call the *artificial day*, consisting of 24 hours, day and night: and till such Third day (or νυχθημερον) was begun, Christ rested in the Grave; otherwise, though he were in the Grave (part of) *Three days*, yet but *Two nights*.

So *Luke* 2. 21. *When Eight days were accomplished* (*for the Circumcision of the Child*) *they called his name Jesus*; that is, *upon the Eighth day, inclusively*; reckoning the day of Birth for the first, and the day of Circumcision for the last (of the Eight days) which with six whole days between make Eight. (Whereas, if Eight *whole days* had been *fully* past, Christ had been Circumcised the *Tenth* day.) The Sense being the same with that concerning *John the Baptist*, Luk. 1. 59. *On the Eighth day they came to Circumcise the Child*. So here, *After Eight days*, that is *on the Eighth day*, or *after the Eighth day was come*. And this, I think, is the constant Language of Scripture every where. And his Objection needs no other Answer, but, *that St.* John *did not speak English*.

And I cannot but think (however he please thus to object) that himself doth believe this, *after Eight days*, to be here meant of the *First day* of the next Week, (and he should have been so candid as to own it.) And that *post Octo dies* is the same in sense with *Octo post diebus*, that is, *the Eighth day after*, (*reckoning the present day for one*,) and that it is so to be understood in this place. We should not, in a serious *Enquiry*, press what *possibly might* be, but what we truly think *is* the meaning. A Lawyer at the Bar may fairly propose *For* his Client, what *possibly may* be the Sense of such or such a Clause. But a Judge on the Bench (and a Counsellor, *To* his Client,) is to consider what *really is* the Sense of Words in question. I dare appeal to himself, whether (in his own thoughts) he do not think *after Eight days*, here to signifie the same, as *after Eight days were accomplished*, Luk. 2. 21. And, if so, then this is rather *to Wrangle*, than *to Dispute fairly*.

Before I dismiss this place, it is not amiss to take more particular notice about what time it was that *Mary Magdalen* and the other Women came to the Sepulchre on the day of Christs Resurrection. 'Tis said *Luke* 23. 55, 56. *When they beheld the Sepulchre and how the body was laid*, (on the sixth day at night whereon he was Crucified) *they returned and prepared Spices and Ointments, and rested the Sabbath day according to the Commandment*. And in the next words *Luk.* 24. 1. *Now upon the First day of the Week, very early in the morning, they came to the Sepulchre*

pulchre bringing the Spices which they had prepared. In *Mat.* 28. 1. *In the end of the Sabbath when it began to dawn toward the First day of the Week.* In *Mark* 16. 1. *When the Sabbath was past, very early in the morning the First day of the Week, they came to the Sepulchre at the rising of the Sun,* or *by Sun-rising.* And *Joh.* 20. 1. *The First day of the Week, early, when it was yet dark, they came to the Sepulchre.* (Perhaps all the Women did not come just at the same time, but were all there by Sun-rising.) But the Body was raised before they came, as is agreed by all the Evangelists.

Where I observe First that the Sabbath, according to their Account, did not end till toward the morning of the next day. The *end of the Sabbath*, or when *the Sabbath was past*, was *early in the morning, before the Sun-rising*, while *the day did begin to dawn*, and while it *was yet dark*. Very *early* indeed in the morning, but yet not till *morning*, (not in the Evening over night.) And therefore (without disputing how the day was reputed to begin in the time of *Moses*) 'tis manifest that, at this time, as well the Sabbath as other days was by them reckoned not from (the beginning of) the Evening to (the beginning of the Evening, but rather (according to the Rom. account) from Midnight to Midnight.

For 'tis manifest that it was toward Evening of the Sixth day before the Crucifixion was over; For it was some while *after the Ninth hour* (that is, after our Three a Clock) that *he cryed with a loud voice and gave up the Ghost*, Mark 15. 34, 37. And it was yet later, when they *brake the Legs of the two Thieves*, (that they might not remain on the Cross upon the Sabbath) but only *pierced his side*, because he was *already dead*, Joh. 19. 31, 32, 33, 34. And later yet when *Joseph* of *Arimathea* begged his Body and buried it. For 'tis expressly said, *When Even was come there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, and begged the body of Jesus, and when he had taken the Body, he wrapped it in a clean linnen Cloth and buried it in his own new Tomb*, Matt. 27. 57, 58, 59, 60. Mark 15. 42, 43, 44, 45, 46. Luke 23. 51, 52, 53.

But, though *Even were come* before this time, yet the *Sabbath was not begun*; for it followeth, *Luke* 23. 54. *that day was the Preparation and the Sabbath drew on.*

And after this, *ver.* 55, 56. *the Women who had seen the Sepulchre, and how the Body was laid, returned and prepared Spices and Ointments* (the same night) *but rested the Sabbath day according to the Commandment.* And by this time it must needs be pretty late in the night, while yet the Sabbath was not begun. That is, I suppose not till Midnight of the Sixth day.

Nor

Nor was the Sabbath ended when Evening began on the Seventh day. For if so, the Women might that night have *brought* and applyed their *Spices and Ointments* which they *had prepared* the night before. For they had as much time so to do, after the Evening was begun that night (if the Sabbath were now ended) as they had, to do what was done the night before; after that Evening was then begun. Nothing hindered them but because the Sabbath was not yet done, and they were to *rest the Sabbath day according to the Commandment*. But, so soon as well they could, *when the Sabbath was ended*, they came *early*, the next *morning*, while it *was yet dark*. And might as well have come the night before, if the Sabbath had ended when the evening began

I add farther, If the Sabbath had ended at the evening of the Seventh day, and the First day of the Week had then begun (as this Author would have it,) Christ might have risen that night (for it would then have been the *Third day*,) and not have stay'd in the grave (for the third day) till the next morning, which yet we know he did.

'Tis manifest therefore that the First day of the Week did begin from the middle of the night, not from the First Evening of the Seventh day. And that Christ was risen *very early in the morning* of that *First day* while it was yet dark.

We are next to Consider how long that First day lasted. After Christ was risen *early* in the morning while it was yet *dark*, (how early that was, we cannot tell, but it was *in the Morning*, not over night;) he appeared first to *Mary Magdalen*, and the Women who went to the Sepulchre; they, as they were directed, carried news of it to the Disciples; and *when they were going*, (Mat. 28. 11.) *the Watch came into the City and shewed to the High-Priests the things which were done; who, calling a Councel, gave the Souldiers Money to say, His Disciples came and stole him away while they were asleep*; undertaking to *secure them* in case the *Governour* should come to hear it.

Upon this news being brought by the Women to the Disciples, Two of them, from the rest, went to the Sepulchre to enquire into the business; and brought an account of it to the rest, who were Astonished at it.

And all this happened before the Two Disciples began their Journey to *Emmaus*; for they discoursed of it by the way, and told it to *Jesus* who fell into their Company. *Luk* 24. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. Now their Journey from *Jerusalem* to *Emmaus*, was *about Threescore Furlongs*, yet it is which our Author rightly computes

putes to be about *Seven miles and an half*, of our miles; which they Travelled *on foot*, for 'tis ſaid *they walked*, (Mark 16. 12.) and *Jeſus* in their company, Preaching to them (out of *Moſes and the Prophets*) the Doctrine of Chriſt's Death and Reſurrection.

When they came near to *Emmaus* it was *towards Evening, and the day far ſpent*, (Luk. 24. 29.) they did there abide for ſome time, and *Jeſus* with them, continuing to Preach on the ſame Subject, and was at length known to them by *breaking of Bread*, ver. 30. 35. After which they returned to *Jeruſalem* and *told* theſe things to the *Diſciples then gathered together*, ver. 33. By which time (having now *walked* another *Seven miles and an half*) we may reaſonably ſuppoſe it to be pretty late at night; For, when they firſt approached to *Emmaus* it was then ſo late, as that it was not thought convenient (unleſs upon ſome ſuch great occaſion) to Travel further, *ver.* 28.

Yet, after they were come back to *Jeruſalem*, Chriſt then appeared himſelf to the Diſciples, *bleſſing* them, *reproaching their unbelief*, *confirming* their *Faith*, giving them *Inſtructions*, and *Commiſſion for Preaching the Goſpel, and Planting the Chriſtian Church*. And it was yet but *the ſame day at evening, being the Firſt day of the Week*, (Joh. 20. 19.) on which he roſe: but, now late at night, *when the doors were ſhut*; that is, (if I miſtake not) ſo late as that it was time to ſhut up doors as men uſe to do towards bed-time. Not as if Chriſt came in through the Key-hole (any more than did the Two Diſciples that came from *Emmaus*) or did Penetrate the doors, (as the Papiſts would have us think in favour of their *Tranſubſtantiation*;) For they were not ſo ſhut but that they could, be opened again (upon occaſion) to let him in (as they had been to let in thoſe Two that came from *Emmaus*) as well as to let in *Peter* (late at night) *Act.* 12. 16.

So that from *very early* in the *Morning* while it was *dark*, till very *late night* and about *Mid-night*, was the *ſame day*, the *firſt day of the Week*. 'Tis manifeſt therefore that about our Saviours time, according to the Computation of the New-Teſtament, both the Jews and the Four Evangeliſts did reckon their days from mid-night to mid-night. And if they did not ſo reckon, Chriſt could not be ſaid (*Mat.* 12. 40.) to *be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*. For it was *Evening*, when *Joſeph begged* the Body of *Jeſus*, and later yet before he *had buryed* it, and yet this muſt be reckoned *part of the Sixth day*, elſe he had not been *three days* in the *Grave*, or *heart of the earth*.

And I think they were ſo reckoned in the times of the Old Te-

ſtament alſo. Which though it be not ſo much to the preſent purpoſe, yet (if you will pardon this digreſſion) I will tell you why I think ſo. It is I know an Opinion taken up by ſome (and I find it is grown pretty current even amongſt Learned men) that the Jews in the time of the Old Teſtament did reckon their days from Evening to Evening (whether they mean from Sun-ſet to Sun-ſet, or from Six a Clock to Six a Clock, I cannot tell, nor perhaps are they all agreed as to that point.) But I take it to be a miſtake; which being at firſt taken up without ſufficient ground, hath ſince paſſed (without further examination) from hand to hand.

We find *Exod.* 12. 6. the Paſs-over was to be killed in the Firſt month, on *the Fourteenth day in the Evening*; which I think is agreed by all to be the Evening at the end of the Fourteenth day, (not that at the end of the Thirteenth,) for the next morning was the Fifteenth day; which evening therefore belonged to the Fourteenth day.

But it is noted in the Margin of our Bibles, that it is, in the Hebrew, *between the two Evenings*. You'l ask perhaps, what are thoſe *two Evenings*: I'le tell you what I think they are.

The word *Day*, you know, is taken in a double ſenſe. Sometimes for (what we call) the *Natural* day (as it is contradiſtinguiſhed to night) from Sun-riſing to Sun-ſetting: ſometimes for (what we call) the *Artificial* day (or νυχθήμερον) ſo as to take in both day and night. Our Saviour tells us *there are Twelve hours in the day*; meaning the *Natural* day. But in the *Artificial* day (of which we are now ſpeaking) there be *Four and Twenty* hours. Some pleaſe to call that the *Natural* day, which I call the *Artificial* (for all do not uſe the words in the ſame ſenſe) But that matters not, ſo long as we underſtand one another.

Now by the word *Evening* is underſtood *the end of the day*. Which, as to the *Natural* day, is at *Sun-ſet*; but as to the *Artificial* day, it is (I think) at *Mid-night*. And conſequently, *between the two Evenings*, is as much as to ſay, *after Sun-ſet, and before Mid-night*. And this is what, in our Language, we commonly call *the Evening*, which is in the Hebrew *between the two Evenings*, (that is, between the *end* of the *Natural* day, and the *end* of the *Artificial* day:) and within this time was the Paſs-over to be *Killed*, *Roſted* and *Eaten*; *Nothing of it was to remain till the Morning*; that is, not after *Mid-night*; for as ſoon as *Mid-night* is paſt *Morning* begins. And within this time all *Leaven* was to be put away; that is before the Mid-night of the Fourteenth day. Which is ſo fair an account of it, as that we need

need not ſcruple to embrace it. And it was the *Fifteenth* day, that was the *firſt day* of the *Feaſt of Unlevened bread;* (all *Leven* being put away before Mid-night,) and this Fifteenth day was to be kept as a *Sabbath*, and a *Holy Feaſt to the Lord*, ver. 14. (on what ever day of the Week it chanced to fall.) And ſo was the *One and Twentieth* day, which was the laſt of thoſe Seven days: *Seven days ſhall ye eat Unleavened-bread; even the firſt day ye ſhall put away* (or ſhall *have put* away) *leaven out of your houſe. And in the Firſt day there ſhall be an Holy Convocation, and in the Seventh day there ſhall be an Holy Convocation; no manner of Work ſhall be done in them, ſave that which every man ſhall eat;* (that is they are to be kept as a *Sabbath* or day of *Holy Reſt;*) ver. 15, 16. From the *Fourteenth day at evening* till the *One and Twentieth day at evening*, ver. 18. that is, from the Fourteenth day at Mid-night, till the One and Twentieth at Mid-night. And in like manner, *Lev.* 23. 32. *from Even to Even*, or Night to Night, that is, from Mid-night to Mid-night; or from the *end of one Evening* to the *end of the next Evening*. So in *Levit.* 23. 5. and *Numb.* 28. 16, 17. *In the Fourteenth day of the Firſt month is the Paſs-over of the Lord; and in the fifteenth day of this month is the feaſt; Seven days ſhall unleavened bread be eaten*, &c. Where it is manifeſt that the *fourteenth* day which is the *Lords Paſs-over*, is another day from the *fifteenth* which is the *firſt day of the Feaſt. For I will paſs through the land of* Egypt (ſaith God) *this night;* (that is the night of the Fourteenth day) *and will ſmite all the firſt born in the land of* Egypt, *Ex.* 12. 12. And what time of the night it was, we are told *ver.* 28. *And it came to paſs at Mid-night the Lord ſmote all the firſt born of the land of* Egypt. And to the ſame purpoſe *Moſes* tells *Pharaoh*, chap. 11. 4, 5, 6, 7, *Thus ſaith the Lord, About Mid-night will I go out into the midſt of* Egypt, *And the firſt born of the land of* Egypt *ſhall dy, from the firſt born of* Pharaoh, &c. *that ye may know that the Lord hath put a difference between the* Egyptians *and* Iſrael. So that the *fourteenth day*, which was the *Lords Paſs-over* continued till the *Mid-night* of that day; and then began the *fifteenth day* which was *the firſt day of the Feaſt*. Than which I think nothing can be more clear. And *Num.* 33. 3. *The fifteenth day of the firſt month is the morrow after the Paſs-over*. In like manner, *Deut.* 16. 6. *Thou ſhalt Sacrifice the Paſs-over at even, at the going down of the Sun*, (that is, after the going down of the Sun, or when the Sun is gone down) *at the ſeaſon that thou cameſt forth out of* Egypt, which was about *Mid-night*, Ex. 12. 21. Ex. 11. 4.

What he offers from *Gen.* 1. 5. is eaſily anſwered. *The evening and the morning were the firſt day*, (and ſo of the other days;) Whence he would have it thought, that the day is to begin at the begining of the Evening. Or (as the Margin tells us it is in the Hebrew) *the evening was, and the morning was, the firſt day.* Or, *there was evening, and there was morning, day one*, (for in ſuch order the words ſtand in the Hebrew.) Or, *and was evening, and was morning, day one.* That is, there was in the firſt day, (and ſo in the reſt) *evening and morning;* or darkneſs and light; And the Dark is put firſt, becauſe (beginning the day from Mid-night) the dark is before the Light. And by *day one*, is meant *the firſt day.*

And it was moreover very agreable ſo to reckon. For, ſuppoſing Paradiſe the principal ſeat of Action; the Sun may reaſonably be ſuppoſed to be Created (in the middle of the Fourth day, *Gen.* 1. 16.) in the *Meridian* of that place, (as in its greateſt Splendor) or, if not in the Meridian of that place, it muſt needs be in the Meridian of ſome place: and wherever that be, the day (of 24 hours) being there half paſt, it muſt have begun at Mid-night foregoing. And I doubt not but a Child born on *Saturday night at Ten a Clock*, was to be Circumciſed the *next Saturday* (as being the *Eighth day*,) not on the *Sunday after.*

I have inſiſted the longer on this, becauſe I find him afterward moving another queſtion about what time the Sabbath is to *begin* and *end*, and lays great ſtreſs upon it, as we ſhall ſee anon.

Of which I think we need not be further ſolicitous than to begin and end this day, according as other days are accounted to begin and end in the places where we live. I do not think the *Fourth Commandment* to deſcend to theſe *Punctilio's.*

But, if he think it neceſſary to be more curious in it; I take it to be very plain from what I have ſaid, that at the time of Chriſts Death and Reſurrection, it was accounted to begin *very early in the morning*, while it was dark, and continue till *very late at night*, according as we now account our days, from Mid-night to Mid-night. But I go on.

We have now found our Saviours *Example*, as to the two Firſt Sundays from his Reſurrection (if at leaſt their *firſt day of the Week* be our *Sunday*) imploying the day in Religious Exerciſes and Sabbatical Affairs with his Diſciples. How many more Sundays he ſo ſpent with them we cannot tell. Which Examples of his Two firſt, with their Imitation of him in others after, (of which we are to ſpeak by and by,) and the Churches practiſe ever ſince

ſince, looks ſo like the *Celebration* and *Inſtitution* of a Chriſtian Sabbath, or *day of Holy Reſt and Religious Exerciſe*, as that we may warrantably do the like. I am ſure it is more than he can ſhew for the *Saturday Sabbath* in *Gen.* 2. 3. Save that men are apt to think a ſmall thing an *Inſtitution* and *Jus Divinum* for what they fanſy; but, as to what they do not, nothing will ſerve but Full Expreſs Words.

We have next clear Evidence, of a like *Practiſe* (conſonant to this *Example*) in *Act.* 20. 7. *On the firſt day of the Week, when the Diſciples came together to break bread, Paul Preached unto them ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his Speech until Mid-night.* Which is ſo plain that he is much put to his ſhifts to avoid it. That here is a *Religious Aſſembly* of the Diſciples, he doth not deny; *Paul* was *Preaching* very late, even till Mid-night, and they met to *break bread*, which I think is generally agreed by Interpreters, to ſignify the Celebration of the *Lords Supper*; and I know not well what clearer Character we need demand of a *Religious meeting for Worſhip*, ſutable to the Work of a *Sabbath* or *Holy Reſt.* And it was ἐν τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτων, which I think he will not deny (though he ſeem to cavil at it) to ſignify, *on the firſt day of the Week.* But he excepts, that the word διελέγετο here tranſlated *Preached*, is elſewhere render'd *Reaſoned* or *Diſcourſed.* Be it ſo, and if that word will pleaſe him better, let it be ſo here; he *reaſoned, diſcourſed, treated*, or *did hold forth*; that I think will not alter the caſe; and he continued, or held on (παρέτεινε) this *Diſcourſe*, this *Speech*, this *Sermon*, (τὸν λόγον *Sermonem*) till Mid-night; (he *held on* this *holding forth* till Mid-night) which I take to be the ſame with what we now call *Preaching*, (or very like it;) 'twas a long continued diſcourſe to a Congregation met together on a Religious account for the Service of God. But let it be called (if he pleaſe) a *Religious Diſcourſe* of the Holy *Apoſtle* to a *Congregation* of *Chriſtians* met together for ſuch a purpoſe.

He would then have it thought a favour or condeſcention to *admit* this *breaking of bread*, to be meant of the *Lords Supper*; and not barely a *Common eating*. But ſince he doth not deny it, we will accept the favour and take it ſo to be; συνηθροισμένων τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ κλάσαι ἄρτον, *The Diſciples being congregated or aſſembled to break Bread.* 'Tis τῶν μαθητῶν, *The Diſciples*; (not τινὲς *ſome* of them:) and they were (perhaps not *every one* but the *generality* of them, as at other meetings) συνηθροισμένοι *congregated* or *aſſembled*; and it ſeems to be a *good full Congregation*, by *Eutychus*'s being mounted to the

third

third loft (whatever he meant by that *third loft*, though but the *third ſcaffold*,) ſo high that by a *fall* from thence he was in great danger of being *killed*. Now it is not likely that ſuch a *Congregation* of Chriſtians were thus *aſſembled* for *common eating*.

He ſays, *Paul* was to *go away on the Morrow*. True; But it is not ſaid they came together to *take leave of Paul*; but, came together *to Break Bread*. *Paul's* going away on the Morrow, might be the reaſon (and I believe was) why they continued there *ſo long*: but the *End* for which they came together, was to *Break Bread*: and the *occaſion* of their ſo coming, becauſe it was the *firſt day of the Week*: On which, it ſhould ſeem, they were wont ſo to do for that end. And if he candidly conſider it, methinks it ſhould ſeem ſo to him. *Paul came to them at Troas in five days, where he abode ſeven days: And on the firſt day of the week, when the Diſciples came together to break Bread, Paul preached to them.* Doth not the fair proſpect of the place import thus much, that they were *then* met to break Bread, as being *the firſt day of the week*? What other occaſion was there of mentioning what *day of the Week* it was? It had been otherwiſe a fairer tranſition to have ſaid, *He ſtaid there Seven days, , and on the Seventh day* (or the *laſt of thoſe Seven*) *the Diſciples came together to take leave of Paul and Sup with him over night, who was to depart on the morrow.* Now if it had been ſaid *on the Seventh day* (though meaning but the laſt of *thoſe Seven*) it would no doubt have been urged as a great argument of *Paul's* keeping a *Seventh day* Sabbath, and the *Diſciples with him*; not as a *Jewiſh* but as a *Chriſtiam* Aſſembly; for *breaking of bread* (which was a *Chriſtian* not a *Jewiſh* Service;) For then, *breaking of bread*, would certainly have been the *Lords Supper*: (But becauſe it was *on the firſt day of the Week*) it muſt now be but *common eating*, to *take leave of Paul*, and to *Sup with him*; as (he tells us *p.* 57.) *Friends commonly do* (*when a Miniſter or any other ſpecial Acquaintance inteuds to take a Journey in the morning*) *to ſup with him over night*. But if he thinks this to be all which is there meant by *the Diſciples coming together on the firſt day of the Week to Break Bread*; he muſt excuſe me if I cannot be of his Opinion.

But becauſe he is content to *admit* (upon ſome terms) their meeting might be upon a *Religious account*, for *the Lords Supper* (as no doubt it was) I ſhall preſs him no further therein: but accept of his condeſcenſion.

When he tells us, that μία is Greek for *one*, and therefore μία σαββάτων may as well be rendered *One day of the Week*, as the *Firſt*

First day of the Week: Surely he is not in earneſt. Such trifling doth more hurt than help his cauſe. No doubt, but, when ever they met, it was *one day of the Week*, we need not be told it; nor need the word *Week* be added, he might as well have ſaid *one day*; nor need he have ſaid ſo much. But this Author cannot think (nor doth he) that μία σαββάτων doth any where ſignify other than the *firſt* day of the Week. In the whole ſtory of Chriſts Reſurrection, and what followed on that day in all the Four Evangeliſts, we have no other word for it but μία σαββάτων, nor have we any other word for it (that I know of) there or any where elſe. I do not know that it is any where called πρώτη σαββάτων. Such ſhifting doth not look well.

'Tis ſomewhat like the Story of a man who *bought a Horſe* for *Five Pounds* to be paid the *next day*. And accordingly on the next day he ſent *Five Pounds of Candles*. Perhaps (in the Bargain) it was not ſaid *expreſly* (in words at length) *Five Pounds of Lawful Money of* England. But, by common intendment, it muſt be ſo underſtood. (And an *honeſt Engliſh Jury*, upon a Tryal, would ſo *Find* it.)

The Latin word *Pridie*, is a Derivative (or Compound rather) from *præ*, *prior*; and *Poſtridie* from *poſt*, *poſterior*; and accordingly (in Latin) *pridie Calendarum*, and *poſtridie Calendarum* muſt ſignify *a day before*, and *a day after* the Calends. But can any man think it is meant of any day? No, but the *next* day *before*, and the *next* day *after*.

So if we ſay, Chriſt was Crucified *one* day *before* the Sabbath, and Roſe again *one* day *after* the Sabbath. This *one* day is *the next* day. And ſo any man who hath not a mind to Cavil, will underſtand it. And ſo μία σαββάτων, *one day after the Sabbath*, muſt needs be underſtood of *the next day after the Sabbath*: Nor is it ever uſed in any other ſenſe. If it were to be underſtood of *any* indefinitely, it ſhould be τις *ſome day* after the Sabbath, not μία *one day* after.

But the moſt pleaſant ſhift of all, is, when he would have us think that this Evening (which is called the firſt day of the Week) was *the Evening after the Seventh day*, that is *Saturday night*; and the next morning (when *Paul* was to go away) was *Sunday morning* (and he to travel that Sunday:) And that the *Evening* of *Saturday* was the beginning of *Sunday*, and was therefore called *the Firſt day of the Week*. Becauſe it is ſaid *Gen.* 1. *the evening and the morning was the Firſt day*, (and ſo of the reſt,) and therefore *the evening was the beginning of every day*. See what

what ſhift a man will make, rather than quit an Opinion he hath once taken up.

We are taught that on *the Fourteenth day of the firſt month at even* the Paſs-over was to be killed. Doth he think that this *Fourteenth day at even* was the *end of the Thirteenth day*, the Fourteenth day then *beginning?* I think every body elſe takes it to be the evening at the end of the fourteenth day, and the Fifteenth day (on the morrow) was the firſt day of the Feaſt of Unleavened Bread. For though it were the *fourteenth day at evening*, yet it was the *fourteenth day*, not the *fifteenth.*

And *Luke* 23. 54. the evening after our Saviours Crucifixion, on the ſixth day, when it was *late at night* (as was ſhewed before, and muſt be, according to the ſtory of what had been done before that time) was yet but *the preparation*, not the *Sabbath*, the *Seventh day* being not yet begun. For ſo we have it, *it was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on.* And the Women were then *preparing their Spices and Oyntments*, yet *reſted the Sabbath day according to the Commandment;* So that the Sabbath day was not yet begun; nor was it ended when the evening of the next day began, but on the morning of the day following, as was ſhewed above.

And (as we ſhewed at large before) the *firſt day of the Week* (on which Chriſt roſe) began *very early in the morning while it was dark*, and continued (the *ſame* day) till *very late at night.* And this is the conſtant Language of the New Teſtament every where.

So that when the *Congregation* of Chriſtians, *Acts* 20. 7. *did on the firſt day of the Week* aſſemble *to break Bread*, and Paul *Preached* to them, continuing his *Sermon* till Mid-night; this muſt needs be on what we call *Sunday;* and the morning following was *Munday morning;* not *Sunday morning* as this Author would have it.

'Tis manifeſt therefore, that there was a *Religious Aſſembly*, of the Chriſtian Congregation at *Troas*, on the *Firſt day of the Week*, for celebration of the *Lords Supper*, and *Preaching;* and *Paul* with them. Which I take to be the celebration of a Chriſtian Sabbath.

However, this (he ſays) is but *One Inſtance.* True, this is but one. (But we have heard of more before, and ſhall hear of more by and by.) But this *one* is more than he can ſhew for more than *Two Thouſand Five Hundred Years* (from God's reſting on the Seventh day *Gen.* 2. 3. till after *Iſrael* was come out of *Egypt* Ex. 16.) during which time he would have us think the Seventh-

day

day Sabbath was constantly observed. And if he could shew any *one* such instance (of *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, or other,) where such a *Religious Assembly*, for the Worship of God, was held on *the seventh day in course from the Creation*; he would think his point well proved, though no more were said of it than is of this.

Whereas now as to the time from thence to the Floud, he brings no other proof, but that *Abel*, and *Enoch*, and *Noah* were good men (as no doubt they were) and therefore it is to be presumed *they kept a Sabbath*; and that upon the *seventh day*. Which is to *beg* the question, not to *prove* it.

From thence till *Israels* going into *Egypt*, all that he brings to prove this matter of fact is but that of *Gen.* 13.6. where (speaking of *Abram* and *Lot*, with the multitude of their Cattel) it is said, *the land was not able to bear them that they might Dwell together; for their substance was great so that they could not Dwell together; and there was a strife between the Herd-men of Abrams Cattle, and the Herd-men of Lots Cattle*, &c. They could not *Dwell* together, that is (saith he) they could not *Rest* together, that is, they could not keep a *Sabbath* together; therefore (he concludes) they did *use* to keep a *Sabbath*; and that *Sabbath* was *the seventh day in course from the Creation*. And is not this a goodly proof? I should think (if he would put a stress on the word *Rest*) it should rather signify, they could not *live quietly* together without their *herd-mens quarrelling* about their Pasture; for so it follows in the next words, *there was a strife* between their *herds-men*.

From thence till after their coming out of *Egypt*, he brings no other proof but that of *Ex.* 5. 4, 5. Where, when *Moses* and *Aaron* had been pressing *Pharaoh* to let *Israel* go *three days Journey into the Wilderness, to keep a Feast and Sacrifice to the Lord their God*; *Pharaoh* replies, *Wherefore do ye Lett* (or *hinder*) *the People from their Work; you make them rest from their Burdens*, or *you take them off from their Work*; that is, says he, *you make them keep a Sabbath*. For the Word or Verb there Translated *you make them Rest* is, (he tells us) a derivative from another Verb which signifies *to Rest*, from which Verb the word *Sabbath* is also derived: They did therefore *Rest* (saith he) that is *keep a Sabbath*, and that Sabbath was *every Week*, and it was on *the seventh day in course from the Creation*.

Alas! how little do either or both of these places prove, of what he would have to be granted him thence! He tells us sometimes there were other *Sabbaths*, besides that of the *seventh* day; I am sure there were other *Restings*.

If *Moſes* and *Aaron* had deſired *Pharaoh* to excuſe them from their Work *one day in ſeven*, that on ſuch day they might ſerve the Lord their God; it would have looked like an Argument. But when it is, *to go three days into the Wilderneſs to keep a Feaſt to the Lord*; what is this to a *Weekly Sabbath?*

This *Seventh-day-ſabbath*, ſo runs in the mind of this Author, that if any where he can lay hold of the word *Reſt*, it muſt preſently prove a *Seventh-day-ſabbath*. Elſe who would have thought, that becauſe *Abram* and *Lot* could not *dwell* quietly together; therefore they muſt needs keep a *Sabbath*, and that upon the *ſeventh* day, and in courſe from the *Creation?* And the like of the *Iſraelites* in *Egypt*, becauſe *Moſes* and *Aaron* are ſaid to *hinder* them from their work; Therefore they did conſtantly keep a weekly *Sabbath*, and that upon the *ſeventh* day, in courſe from the *Creation*.

He might have to better purpoſe, alleged *Pharaoh*'s *ſeven fat kine and ſeven lean ones*, and the *ſeven full Ears of Corn, and ſeven empty*; for here we have the number *ſeven* ſignalized; only theſe were Seven *Years*, not Seven *Days*; and the like of *Nebuchadnezzar*'s being *ſeven years* turned out to the *Beaſts of the field*, Dan. 4. 25, 32, 33. Or that of the *Clean Beaſts and Fowls* coming into the Ark by *ſevens*, Gen. 7. 2, 3.

But, what is more to his purpoſe (and which he ſhould not have miſſed) is that of *Gen.* 7. 4. and *Gen.* 8. 10, 12. where we have the interval of *ſeven days* particularly mentioned; *For yet ſeven days, and I will cauſe it to rain upon the Earth*, &c. (Chap. 7. 4.) where God gives to *Noah* juſt a *Weeks warning* of the time when the Floud ſhould begin, during which interval (if thoſe days were Sabbath days) he might remove himſelf and what was neceſſary into the Ark before the next Sabbath. And, toward the end of the Floud, *Noah* ſends out the *Dove*, Chap. 8. 8. *And he ſtaid ſeven days, and again ſent forth the Dove*, ver. 10. *And he ſtaid yet other ſeven days, and ſent forth the Dove*, &c. ver. 12. Where we have the Dove ſent out three times, juſt at *ſeven days* diſtance. And how do we know but that theſe *three days* were three *Sabbath days?* Which though it be not a concluſive Argument, is better than any that he brings. For here we have three *Intervals* of *ſeven days*, in theſe two Chapters.

But if a Weekly Sabbath were then kept, 'tis very ſtrange that we ſhould have no intimation of any ſuch thing in the books of *Moſes* (before *Iſrael's* coming out of *Egypt*.) And much more, that there is nothing of it in the Book of *Job*. And, that none of

of his friends (amongſt the many charges they bring againſt him) ſhould never object his *Neglect of the Sabbath*, or want of *due obſervance* thereof. Which being ſo plauſible an objection, it ſeems more likely, that a Sabbath was not then wont to be obſerved: for which he hath ſo very little to ſhew. And by what we have *Job* 1. 4. It ſhould ſeem that *Job*'s *Seven* Sons kept *Feaſting* (each in his own day) for *Seven days together*; without any mention of a *Sabbath* intervening. Nor was it a *Religious Feaſt*, but a Feaſt of *mirth* and *jollity*, ſuch as made *Job* ſuſpicious leſt they *might ſin and curſe God in their heart*, v. 5. And therefore he offer'd propitiatory *Sacrifices for them continually*, or (as the Margin tells us it is in the Hebrew) *all the days*, that is every of theſe *Seven days*.

As little a matter will ſerve his turn to prove (*p.* 43.) that Chriſts *Aſcenſion* was, and his coming to *Judgment* is to be, on a *Saturday*, or *Seventh-day-Sabbath*: Becauſe it is ſaid *Acts* 1. 12. that *Mount Olivet* (whence he aſcended) is, from *Jeruſalem*, *a Sabbath-days Journey*.

But he tells us that *by no account that he can make*, *can he aſſign the Aſcenſion on the Firſt day*, (No more can I.) But what then? Well! But why upon a *Saturday* rather than a *Sunday*? Becauſe he obſerves, that after Chriſt's *Aſcenſion* from Mount *Olivet*, it is ſaid, *Then they returned to Jeruſalem, from Mount Olivet, which is from Jeruſalem a Sabbath-days Journey*. Well! what of this? *He cannot ſee why it was expreſly ſaid, that it was but a Sabbath-days Journey from Jeruſalem, but becauſe it was the Sabbath-day.*

Perhaps I may ſhew him another reaſon as likely as it. If the word *then* do not there ſignify *the ſame day* (but only at large, *after his Aſcenſion*) this is nothing to the purpoſe. But admitting that by *then* be meant *the ſame day*; the connexion runs fairly thus, *After his Aſcenſion they returned from thence to Jeruſalem the ſame day, for it was* (ἐγγὺς) *but a little way off, about a Sabbath-days Journey*. Which, I think, is a fair account of the place; Eſpecially ſince we know otherwiſe, that it was *not* upon a Sabbath day.

Again, if this (of a *Sabbath-days Journey*) ſhould intimate, it was on a *Sabbath* day; why on a *Seventh* day, rather than a *Firſt* day? and why *upon no account* upon the *Firſt*? For, if the Firſt day were then a *Sabbath* (as we think it was) that of *not traveling more than a Sabbath-days Journey*, would as well reſpect a *Firſt-days Sabbath*, as a *Seventh-days Sabbath*. So that he is not at all advanced hereby to his Seventh day Sabbath; The ſame

Account (as he ſpeaks) will ſerve *as well* for the one as for the other. But, indeed, for neither.

But how doth this concern his *Coming to Judgment?* Yes, Becauſe it is there ſaid (*ver.* 11.) *He ſhall come in like manner* (ὃν τρόπον) *as ye have ſeen him go into Heaven.* And (becauſe this Author fanſies) he did *Aſcend* on a Sabbath day, therefore (he fanſies alſo) he ſhall on a Sabbath day *come again.* I ſee a *Weak Argument*, with a *ſtrong Fanſy* will go far.

But to prove his Aſcenſion to be on the Sabbath (beſides this, of a Sabbath-days Journey) he adds further, That *Chriſt and his Diſciples were then Aſſembled*, and that *Chriſt Preached.* Well! And why may we not as well conclude that the day of his *Reſurrection* was alſo a *Sabbath?* For *Chriſt and his Diſciples were then aſſembled*, (firſt at *Emmaus*, and then at *Jeruſalem*,) and *Chriſt did then alſo* (at both places) *Preach to them*, and the ſubſtance of his Preaching was much the ſame, (as will appear by comparing *Luk.* 24. with *Acts* 1.) and did then alſo Celebrate the *Lords Supper*. And *eight days after*, Chriſt was again *Aſſembled* with the *Diſciples*, and *Preached to them*, on the ſame day of the Week. If Chriſts *Preſence and Preaching* will prove the *Aſcenſion* day to be a *Sabbath*, why ſhould it not as well prove the *Reſurrection day* to be a *Sabbath?* the onely difference is, That (he thinks) ſerves his turn, But this makes againſt him.

And why ſhould it not alſo be thought a Sabbath, *Acts* 20. *For Paul and the Diſciples were then Aſſembled;* and they were aſſembled *to break Bread*; and *Paul there Preached to them.* And all theſe Aſſemblies were on the *firſt day of the Week.* And they ſeem to me a much ſtronger proof of the *Firſt* day, (the day of his *Reſurrection*) being a Sabbath, than that the *Aſcenſion* day was ſo.

And the *Preaching* which our Author here mentions as on the day of *Aſcenſion*, ſeems to me rather to have been on that of the *Reſurrection.* For St. *Luke* in the beginning of this Chapter of *Acts* 1. ſeems to give a ſhort repetition of what himſelf had delivered more at large *Luk.* 24. And gives an account not only of what happened *on the day of Aſcenſion*, (though he cloſe with it) but of what happened during the *forty days* from his Reſurrection to that time. And this *Preaching*, I take to be that mentioned *Luke* 24. on the day of his Reſurrection.

But (after all) this is but a Whimſey, (what he tells us of Chriſts Aſcenſion on a Seventh-day-Sabbath.) For 'tis very plain that his Aſcenſion was neither on a *ſeventh* day, nor on a *firſt*, but on a *fifth* day of the Week. For 'tis plainly ſaid, *Acts* 1. 3.

That he ſhewed himſelf alive after his Paſſion, being ſeen of them Forty days, (that is, he was ſeen of them at times, not conſtantly, for the ſpace of Fourty days) whereof that of his Reſurrection was the firſt, and that of his Aſcenſion was the laſt. And if that were *Sunday*, this muſt be *Thurſday*. He may *tell it upon his fingers* (as he ſpeaks *p.* 5.) if he pleaſe.

But though our Saviours *Aſcenſion* was not on the *ſeventh* day of the Week (in obſervance of the Seventh-day Sabbath, or in confirmation thereof:) Yet *the miſſion of the Holy Ghoſt* (according as on the Firſt day of the Week, the day of his Reſurrection, he had promiſed. *Luk* 24. 49.) was on the *firſt day of the Week* fulfilled alſo, as appears *Acts* 2. *When the day of Pentecoſt was fully come*, that is, the *Fiftieth day* (for ſo *Pentecoſt* ſignifieth in Greek) *they were all with one accord in one place* (that is, they were unanimouſly aſſembled) *and ſuddenly there came a ſound from Heaven, as of a ruſhing mighty Wind, and filled the houſe, where they were ſitting; And there appeared to them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it ſat upon each of them* (that is, at leaſt, upon each of the Apoſtles,) *and they were all filled with the Holy Ghoſt, and began to ſpeak with other Tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.* Which I take to be a further inſtance, (if our Author will not allow it to be called a Sabbath) at leſt of a *Religious Aſſembly* for the Worſhip of God; (And if it had been on the *ſeventh* day, how great a proof would this have been with him for a *Seventh*-day Sabbath.) This I take to be a *Chriſtian Sabbath*, and within the proſpect of the *Fourth Commandment*. And though it be not expreſly called a *Sabbath* (to avoid confuſion or ambiguity, becauſe the word *Sabbath* in common ſpeech was then appropriated to the Jewiſh Sabbath,) yet it is the ſame thing.

And if he doubt whether the Feaſt of *Pentecoſt* were on the Firſt day of the *Week*, as was that of the *Reſurrection*; he may be ſatisfied from *Levit.* 23. 15. where that Feaſt is appointed. After mention made of the *Paſs-over*, (*ver.* 5. &c.) *Moſes* proceeds to that of the *Wave-offering*, *v.* 10, 11. *When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and ſhall reap the harveſt thereof; then ſhall ye bring a ſheaf of the firſt-fruits of your harveſt unto the Prieſt, and he ſhall Wave the ſheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you; on the morrow after the Sabbath the Prieſt ſhall wave it.*

Whether by the *Sabbath* here mentioned be meant the *Weekly Sabbath*, or the *firſt day of the Feaſt of Unleavened-Bread*, is not material; becauſe, in that year whereof we are ſpeaking, this *firſt day of the Feaſt* was on the *Weekly Sabbath*, (as is manifeſt from

from the ſtory of Chriſts Crucifixion, which was on the Sixth day of the Week, and the next day (being the Seventh day) was the Feaſt of the Paſs-over) and the *morrow after this Sabbath*, was the day of Chriſt's Reſurrection, as well as of the *Wave-offering*. And then he proceeds, *ver.* 15, 16, to the Feaſt of *Pentecoſt*, or the Feaſt of *Weeks*. *Ye ſhall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the ſheaf of the Wave-offering, ſeven Sabbaths ſhall be compleat, even unto the morrow after the ſeventh Sabbath, ſhall ye number Fifty days* (incluſively taken, as the manner is in Scripture reckoning, and muſt needs be ſo here.) It was called the Feaſt of *Pentecoſt*, or the *Feaſt of Weeks* (as *Deut.* 16. 9, 10.) which Feaſt of *Pentecoſt* was the *morrow after the Sabbath*, on a *firſt day of the Week*.

And on this *firſt day of the Week*, (*the morrow after the ſeventh-day Sabbath*) here was a ſolemn *Aſſembly* for *Religious Worſhip*, and a very large one, both of Jews and Gentiles *out of every nation under Heaven, Parthians, Medes, Elamites*, &c. And this ſolemnized by a *Miraculous Effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt*, in the gift of Tongues: *For we all hear* (ſay thoſe of that great Aſſembly) *every one in our own Tongue wherein we were born the wonderful Works of God*, ver. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. With a long *Sermon* of *Peter's* on that occaſion. Which I take to be another celebration of the *Firſt-day Sabbath*; and a very eminent one.

We are to obſerve alſo, that in ſome of the places alleged to this purpoſe, though but *ſingle inſtances*, there is an intimation of a *frequent uſage*. As in that *Act.* 20. 7. *On the firſt day of the week, the diſciples being aſſembled to break bread, Paul preached*, &c. Is a fair intimation, that on the *firſt day* they did *uſe* ſo to *aſſemble*.

If it were ſaid amongſt us, *About ſix a clock, when they were come together* (*in the College-Hall*) *to ſupper, ſuch a thing happened*: Any (unprejudiced) perſon would take it for a fair intimation, that *they uſed to ſupp about ſix a clock*. And if this Author could any where find, in the book of *Job*, that *On the ſeventh day of the week* (from the Creation) when *Job* and his friends were *aſſembled for the joint ſervice of God, Bildad ſpake thus*, &c. He would take this for a *ſtrong proof*, that the *ſeventh-day Sabbath* was then *wont* to be obſerved. Much ſtronger than what he allegeth to that purpoſe, *Abram and Lot had each of them ſo many Cattel, that they could not dwell* (or *reſt*) *together, without quarrellings amongſt their ſervants*. And that of what *Pharaoh* ſaid to *Moſes and Aaron, Why do you Hinder their work, you make the people Reſt from their burthens?*

A like place is that of 1 *Cor.* 16. 1, 2. *Now concerning the Collection*

lection for the Saints, as I have given order to the Churches of Galatia, even ſo do ye: (and what that was, we are told in the next words,) *Upon the firſt day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in ſtore as God hath proſpered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.* (If it had been ſo ſaid to *Noah*, to *Abraham*, or to *Job*, Upon the *Seventh day of the week* do thus or thus; what a ſtrong proof would this have been for the Obſervation of a *ſeventh day* Sabbath!)

I think it is plain from hence, that the *Firſt day of the week*, was *weekly obſerved;* and was *wont* to be ſo obſerved, both by the *Church* of *Corinth*, and by the *Churches* of *Galatia*. For St. *Paul* doth not here *adviſe* it, but *ſuppoſe* it, or take it for granted.

What that order was to the Churches of *Galatia* our Author ſays *he cannot tell.* I thought it had been plain enough: he bids the *Corinthians* do, as he had bid the *Galatians*; that is, *on the Firſt day of the Week*, &c. What *further* order, he had given the *Galatians*, it is not as to this point neceſſary for us to know.

But ſaith he, if they muſt on that day *lay by as God hath bleſſed them, then they muſt on that day caſt up their accounts, tell their mony, reckon their ſtock, compute their Expenſes*, &c. which are not Sabbath-day Works. A wiſe objection! As though all this could not as well be done before (ſo far as is neceſſary) and, on Sunday, put ſo much into the poor mans box (or give to the Deacons or Collectors) as (upon ſuch account) they ſhould have found fit; like as is now done in our Churches when there is occaſion for ſuch Collections.

Why doth he not make the ſame exception to that of *Deut.* 16. 10. concerning the *Feaſt of Pentecoſt?* where they are to bring a *tribute of a free-will-offering, which* (ſays he) *thou ſhalt give unto the Lord thy God*, &c. *according as the Lord thy God hath bleſſed thee;* Doth he think that on the day of *Pentecoſt* (which was to be ſtrictly obſerved as a Sabbath, *a holy Convocation and no ſervile work to be done*, Lev. 23, 1.) they muſt *caſt up their accounts, tell their money*, &c. becauſe they were to offer *according as the Lord hath bleſſed them?* I think not.

But here comes in again his former trifling objection of μία σαββάτων, whether it ſignify, *the firſt day of the Week.* Yet I am very confident, himſelf doth really believe it doth here ſo ſignify, and (as to his own thoughts) doth not doubt of it. But perhaps thinks it a piece of wit, or skill in Greek, thus to object againſt his own judgment. Yet ſince he will have it ſo, (and we muſt come again to Childs play,) I will ſay ſomewhat to it.

Whether

Whether μία σαββάτων be *good Greek* or no, as to the common analogy of that Tongue; or, what is the reaſon of that Syntax; I need not trouble my ſelf to enquire, (becauſe it is nothing to the purpoſe; for we are not inquiring whether it be *good Greek*, but what it here ſignifies.) There are I preſume in all Languages (by negligence or corruption) ſome harſh expreſſions, as to the analogy of the Language, which yet are allowable by common uſage, and well enough underſtood.

He would think it perhaps a little harſh to ſay in Greek τρεσκαιδέκατον, τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατον, (that is in Latine, *tres & decimum, quatuor & decimum,*) for what we ſay in Engliſh *thirteenth*, *fourteenth*; yet ſo they ſpeak. And ſomewhat harſh ὁ νικῶν δώσω αὐτῷ *Rev.* 2. 26. *Rev.* 3. 21. and ὁ νικῶν ποιήσω αὐτὸν, *Rev.* 3. 12. (inſtead of τῷ νικῶντι δώσω, ὁ νικῶντα ποιήσω) yet ſo it is. And ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, yet ſo we find it *Rev.* 1. 4 And many ſuch may be ſhewed.

In Latine, *ideirco, quocirca, poſthac, quapropter, controvertor, paterfamilias, omne genus homines, Æthiops albus dentes, pridie calendas*, and many more, are ſcarce to be accounted for as regular, ſave that they are ſo uſed; but, becauſe they are ſo uſed; they are accounted elegant enough.

In Engliſh; *Methinks* (for *I think*,) *three pound ten ſhillings*, (for *three pounds*, &c.) *three foot nine inches*, *many a one*, *a few Pottage*, and the like, are ſcarce regular; yet are ſo uſed. When a Merchant marks his Parcels (and ſo calls them) *number one*, *number two*, &c. he means *firſt* and *ſecond*. So, *in the Year of our Lord one thouſand ſix hundred and ninety one*, *One thouſand ſix hundred ninety two*, is commonly ſaid; when yet we mean *ninety firſt*, *ninety ſecond*; ſo *one a clock*, *two a clock*, for the *firſt* and *ſecond* hour after Twelve. And other the like caſes, where the *Cardinal* number is put for the *Ordinal*. As it is alſo in *Gen.* 1. *The evening, and morning were* (*jom echad*) *day one*; which the Septuagint renders ἡμέρα μία, and μία doth there ſignify πρώτη. Yet no wiſe man will cavil as to the ſenſe of ſuch expreſſions, (what ever they may do as to the Grammatical *conſtruction*,) when we know what is meant by them.

So here; 'tis true μία doth properly ſignify *one* in common conſtruction: but μία σαββάτων doth never ſignify other than *the firſt of the week*, (either in the New Teſtament or any where elſe,) not *any day of the week*, any more than *one a clock* doth ſignify any other hour than the *firſt* after *twelve*. When a thing is ſaid to be done at *one a clock*; he that ſhall object, this may be *any hour*, for

every

every hour is *one*; would be laugh'd at. And when a Merchant bids his Prentice bring him *number one*, if he bring him what elſe he pleaſes (becauſe every number, is *number one*, or *one number*) he deſerves to be knockt.

Now when every one knows (who underſtands any thing of this nature,) that μία σαββάτων is the *proper name* of that day which is next after the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, as much as *one a clock* is the *proper name* of that hour which is next after *Twelve*: it muſt either be *great ignorance*, or ſomewhat *worſe* ſo to object. I appeal to himſelf, whether ever he met with *that name* (in any Author) in any other ſenſe.

He ſeems to take it very unkindly, *pag.* 66. of thoſe who ſhould think that, by *ſon of man* ſhould be meant an ordinary Man, in *Mar.* 2. 27,28. *The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath; Therefore the Son of Man is Lord alſo of the Sabbath.* Where I think it is plain, that in the former verſe (*the Sabbath was made for Man*, &c.) it is manifeſtly ſpoken of *ordinary Men.* And though in the latter verſe, (*the Son of Man is Lord alſo of the Sabbath,*) by *Son of Man* I ſuppoſe is meant *Chriſt*; yet is that Title given alſo to ordinary Men, elſewhere, very often. As *Job*, 25. 6. *How much leſs Man who is a Worm, and the Son of Man which is a Worm?* And *Iſai.* 51. 12. *Who art thou that ſhouldſt be afraid of a Man that ſhall dy, and of the Son of Man which ſhall be made as Graſs.* So *Pſ.* 8. 4. *What is Man, that thou art mindful of him, and the Son of Man that thou viſiteſt him?* And to the ſame purpoſe, *Pſ.* 144. 3. And (to name no more) in the Book of *Ezekiel*, the Prophet *Ezekiel* is, in that one Book, called *Son of Man*, oftener than Chriſt is ſo called in the whole Bible. And if we would argue as he doth, we might plauſibly object, It might be ſo meant here; though I think it is not. But he cannot ſhew that ever the *Jewiſh* Sabbath was called *the Lords day* (however he thinks it *might* have been;) nor (though μία be Greek for *One*) that μία σαββάτων is ever uſed for other than the *firſt* day of the week, or the *next* after the Jewiſh Sabbath. Nor doth he think it. Such trifling (to give it no harder name) may do well enough in Drollery or Burleſque, but not in a *plain honeſt Enquiry*.

But if he would be curious as to the Phraſe; 'tis plain enough that σαββάτων is not properly the Genitive caſe governed of μίαν. For then it ſhould have been ἡν σαββάτων becauſe σάββατα is of the Neuter Gender. (And 'tis a miſtake therefore when *p.* 58. he renders it by *One of the Sabbaths*, as if it had been ἡν σαββάτων.) But 'tis governed rather of ſome Præpoſition or Particle underſtood, (as ἀπὸ or the like,) and then, as in Latin *pridie calendas* (that is,

prior dies ante calendas) is *the next day before the Calends.* ſo is μία σαββάτων (or μία ἀπὸ σαββάτων) *the next day after the Sabbath:* The full conſtruction is μία ἡμέρα ἀπὸ σαββάτων, (the word ἡμέρα being underſtood in the word μία, and ἀπὸ underſtood in the word σαββάτων,) That is *one day after the Sabbath;* which being the *proper Name* of a day, cannot be meant of any other but *the Next day after.*

'Tis certain therefore that (μία σαββάτων) *the firſt day of the Week,* or the *firſt day after the Jewiſh Sabbath,* was from the Reſurrection of Chriſt and after, eminently ſignalized, as a day of ſpecial *Obſervation;* 'Twas honoured with Chriſts *Reſurrection* on that day; with his firſt *appearance* to *Mary Magdalen* and the other Women; then, to the *Two Diſciples* going to *Emmaus,* and his Religious Aſſembling with them there; after that, to the *Diſciples* at *Jeruſalem* and aſſembling with them the ſame day; and the whole time of thoſe Aſſemblings employed in *Religious Exerciſes,* (Preaching, Celebrating the Sacrament, Inſtructing and Bleſſing his Diſciples, and giving them Commiſſion for Preaching the Goſpel and Planting the Chriſtian Church.) And again with the ſame Diſciples on that day *ſen-night,* aſſembled with them, and in like manner employed. It was ſpecially ſignalized alſo by the Miraculous Effuſion of the *Holy Ghoſt* on that day, in a great aſſembly of *Jews* and *Gentiles* on the day of *Pentecoſt;* and the day employed in *Preaching* and other *Religious exerciſes.* It was obſerved in like manner at *Troas,* in preaching the Word, Celebrating the Sacrament, and other Religious Communion, as things there *uſual* on that day. It was obſerved at *Corinth,* not once onely, but as a thing of *courſe;* and ſo preſumed by the Apoſtle when he gives particular Inſtructions concerning a Collection for the Saints to be made weekly on that day. And in like manner in the Churches of *Galatia,* with a like direction to them. (And we have no reaſon to ſuſpect but that in other Churches alſo, there was a like cuſtome of obſerving that day.) And it is the onely day of the week (unleſs the Seventh-day, in order to the *Jewiſh* Sabbath) that is ſo much as Mentioned by name after the Reſurrection of Chriſt. (At leaſt I do not at preſent remember the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth day of the week by name ſo mentioned.) Now what we have reaſon to believe was ſo generally obſerved after the Reſurrection, by Chriſt himſelf (more than once,) by his Apoſtles, and by the Chriſtian Churches in their days; we have reaſon to believe was according to Chriſts direction. For we know very well, that Chriſt

Chriſt did after his reſurrection *give commandments to the Apoſtles, about things pertaining to the kingdome of God*, and ſetling the Chriſtian Church. What thoſe Commandments were in particular, we cannot tell; but are to preſume that what they did therein, was purſuant of thoſe commands; and this in particular about obſerving *the firſt day of the week*, which we call the *Chriſtian Sabbath*; And which (in contradiſtinction to the *Jewiſh* Sabbath) is called *the Lords-day*; *Rev.* 1. 10. And hath accordingly been ſo called, and ſo obſerved ever ſince. Which being ſo practiſed by the Apoſtles, and ſo continued ever ſince, I take to be a good warrant for us to continue it, as a thing agreeable to the Will of God.

As to what he ſo often objects, that there is no *expreſs command* thereof *recorded*: that is, not ſuch a command as our Author demands. We are not to preſcribe to God in what *terms* he ſhall make known his Will, (any more than the Phariſees, *Mat.* 16. 4. were to preſcribe to Chriſt what kind of *ſigns* he was to ſhew to teſtify his authority;) 'tis ſufficient if God do in his own way intimate what is his Will, though it be it not with the formality of *Be it Enacted*. And thoſe who are willing to be *taught of God*, will be content ſo to underſtand his meaning. An *approved Practiſe* in the Worſhip of God, frequently *Repeated*, atteſted by *Miracles*, encouraged by Chriſts own *Example*, and that of the *Apoſtles* and the *Chriſtian Churches* then, and continued in the *Chriſtian Church* ever ſince: Is to me great evidence of the will of God; and that there was a command for it, though it be not recorded. (Like as I believe that there was, very early, a command from God, to worſhip him by *Sacrifice*, though that Command be not recorded.)

But (to that of its being ſo obſerved ever ſince) he objects, we have nothing but *Tradition*, either that the Chriſtian Sabbath hath been ſo obſerved, or that it is called *the Lords-day*. And *Tradition* is what he takes great pleaſure to exclaim againſt; If that be admitted (ſaith he) where ſhall we ſtop?

Very well! I am not over fond of laying too great a weight upon Traditions; at leaſt not on all things that are pretended ſo to be. But I pray, How can he tell, otherwiſe than by *Tradition*, whether our Saturday or our Sunday, be the Seventh day in courſe from the *Creation*? Or, (if that be too hard a queſtion) whether of the two is the Seventh day of the *Jewiſh week*? I know nothing but *Tradition* for it. I cannot remember ſo long: Nor have I ſo long kept ſo ſtrict account of days as to be ſure of it. I truſt to the common Computation of the world, that our Sab-

bath is a continuation of that Sabbath which the Apoſtles kept. And if ſo, I am ſafe. If not, I cannot help it. And becauſe I think the Apoſtles Sabbath was on the firſt day of the Jewiſh week, therefore I think ours to be ſo. But if theirs was not, neither is ours.

He would not have that of St. *John*, Revel. 1. 10. *I was in the ſpirit on the Lords-day* to be underſtood of *our Sabbath*. And why not? He tells us, 1. Some think it to be *Chriſtmaſs-day*; 2. Some think it to be *Eaſter-day*; and 3. Some think it to be the *Day of Judgment*. And long Diſcourſes we have upon all theſe. Well! But doth he think it to be meant of any of theſe? No. Then, to what purpoſe are theſe alleged, in diſparagement of the Chriſtian Sabbath?

But he ſeems to have ſo great diſpleaſure againſt the *Chriſtian Sabbath*, that whatever he can think of to be Objected (though he do not think it to be true) he will be ſure to Object, (that he may diſparage the Day, or perplex the Argument) as if he were more concerned to beat down the *Chriſtian* Sabbath, than to ſet up the *Jewiſh*. Not conſidering, that, by all this, he is doing their Work who would have none at all. For they know well that the *Jewiſh* Sabbath hath been long ſince laid aſide (without any great fear of returning;) and if they can but throw off the *Chriſtian* Sabbath alſo, 'tis what they would have. And 'tis of a like import what he argues (*p.* 84) for coming to the publick *but once a day*, (not *twice* as our manner is;) For thoſe who care not to come at all, if he diſpenſe with them as to the One, they will diſpenſe with themſelves as to the Other meeting.

I ſhould rather think, that, the whole day being due to the Service of God (publick and private) it is to be parcelled out, as to the number and times of publick meeting; as might (according to Chriſtian Prudence) be judged moſt conducing (in this or that place) to thoſe ends, and to common Edification; and that, to make ſuch little Circumſtances (otherwiſe than as they conduce to thoſe general ends) a matter of *Religious Obſervation*, or *Divine Inſtitution*, is a like extravagance as that of the Phariſees in laying like weight on their Traditions, and that of the Papiſts on their numerous Superſtitious Ceremonies. And is as properly *ſuperſtition*, as theſe.

I do not know this Author, (who thus argues againſt obſerving the Chriſtian Sabbath, and againſt publick meeting on that day more than once;) And therefore am not willing to judge hardly. But the natural reſult of what he argues, is as I told you.

He

He doth not think that *John*, was (on the *Lords day* Rev. 1.10.) keeping *the Anniverſary of Chriſts Incarnation;* nor of his *Reſurrection.* (No more do I.) But why not? Becauſe (ſaith he) *he may ſay as in the caſe of* Moſes's *dead body*, *No man knows of his Sepulchre to this day.* Now as to the *Incarnation*, I am apt to think, that no man doth *At* this day know *certainly*, either on what day of the Year, or what day of the Week Chriſt was born (nor is it any matter whether we do or no.) But I ſhould rather ſay, no man knows *At* this day, than (as he) no man knoweth *To* this day, (as if no man hitherto had known it:) for certainly there have been thoſe who knew it heretofore (while he was alive) though it be now forgotten, and *at this day* no man knows it. But will he ſay ſo as to the *Reſurrection*? I think it is plain, that Chriſt was Crucified on the *fourteenth* day, lay in the Grave the *fifteenth*, and roſe again the *ſixteenth* day, of the *firſt month.* And that he roſe on the *firſt day of the week*, no man doubts. He ſhould rather have put it thus, *As no man knows* To *this day*, *where is the Body of* Moſes, (that it might not be worſhiped,) So *no man knows* At *this day*, *which is the Seventh in courſe from the Creation;* that we might not contend about it.

However, I am contented to admit, (if that will pleaſe him) that *the Lords day* there mentioned was neither meant of *Chriſtmaſs-day*, nor *Eaſter-day*, nor *Whit-ſunday*, nor the *day of Judgment;* but think it to be meant of *the firſt day of the week*, which is the *Chriſtian Sabbath.* Not, of any of thoſe other days mentioned; nor of the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, as he would have it.

'Tis, I think, a new notion of his own (at leaſt I know none other of his mind) that it ſhould be meant of the *Jewiſh Sabbath.* He grants there is *nothing from the Circumſtances of the place to determine it to this day.* Nor doth he pretend to ſhew that the Jewiſh Sabbath *was* ever ſo called. But he thinks it *might have been* ſo called. For he ſays *God bleſſed and ſanctified the ſeventh day* (that is, the Seventh day after Six days of Labour) therefore it *might have been* called the *Lords* day: and ſo may as well the *Chriſtian Sabbath* as the *Jews Sabbath.* That *the Son of Man is Lord alſo of the Sabbath day;* And ſo he is of every day in the Week; and of the *Chriſtian Sabbath* (when that is the Sabbath) as well as of the *Jewiſh.* That the *ſeventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord our God;* that is, the Seventh day after Six days of Labour, but whether the Seventh day in courſe from the Creation, is no where ſaid. That *Iſai.* 58. 13. *The Sabbath* is called *my holy*

holy day: True, on what ever day the Sabbath be: First or Seventh of the Week; or whatever day God appoints to be kept *Holy*; As for instance, *the first and seventh day of the Feast of Unleavened bread*, Ex. 12. 16. The *First* day shall be a *Holy* Convocation; and the *Seventh* day shall be a *Holy* Convocation; and each of them was *the Lords Holy day*, on what ever day of the week they happened. And the like for other days. So *Levit.* 23. 2, 4, 7, 8, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 35, 36, 39. and *Num.* 28. 18, 25, 26. *Num.* 29. 1, 7, 12, 35. All the days here mentioned are *the Lords Holy days*, yet I do not take any of them to be ἡμέρα κυριακὴ. And all he can pretend to from these or whatever he produceth, is no more but that the *Jewish* Sabbath (while it was the Sabbath) *might have* been so called, κυριακὴ ἡμέρα *the Lords day*; he doth not pretend to shew that ever *it was* so called.

Now I would desire this Gentleman (if he can but a little while lay aside his prejudice) to consider, first that *the Lords day* was the *proper name* of a day; whereby it might be known as distinguished from other days; (else to what purpose is it said *I was in the spirit on the Lords day*;) whereas the *proper name* of the *Jewish Sabbath* (and of that onely as he would have us think *p.* 64.) was the *Sabbath day*; and there is no appearance of reason, why, if he meant that day, he should not rather have said *I was in the spirit on the Sabbath day*, or *the seventh day*. This therefore must needs be meant of some other day, known by another name.

2. I would have him next consider, that *the Lord* in the Old Testament is the usual name of *God* indefinitely; without particularizing this or that of the Three persons; and *the Sabbath of the Lord thy God*, doth not appropriate it to the *second* Person more than to the *first* and *third*. And though I do not deny, that our *Christ* was the *God* who gave the Ten Commandments (for all the three Persons are the same God,) yet I do not think it to be Christ onely, as contradistinguished to the other two. And when it is said, *I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other God but me*; the meaning is not, I the *second Person*, am so the Lord thy God, that thou shalt own no *other Person* for thy *God* beside *me the second Person*. But ὁ κύριος *the Lord*, in the *New Testament*, is for the most part applied peculiarly to *our Lord Christ* (God and Man.) and is understood κατ' ἐξοχὴν of him. (As he is called elsewhere κατ' ἐξοχὴν *the Son of Man.*) And accordingly ἡμέρα κυριακὴ must be a day peculiarly appropriate (τῷ κυρίῳ) to *our Lord Christ*; which the Jewish Sabbath was not, nor that of the Fourth Commandment;

which

which is the Sabbath of the *Lord thy God*, that is *of God indefinitely*; for 'tis in that notion that God ſpeaks in the Ten Commandments, not as *one perſon* contradiſtinct to the other two.

It is ἡμέρα κυριακὴ *the Lords day* in a like ſenſe as δεῖπνον κυριακὸν the *Lords Supper*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 20. and ποτήριον κυρίου, τραπέζα κυρίου, *the Cup of the Lord, the Table of the Lord*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 21,22. 1 *Cor.* 11. 27. In all which, by *the Lord* is meant the *Lord Chriſt*, God and Man. And becauſe, there being a double *Sabbath* then in uſe, (the *Jewiſh* Sabbath, and the *Chriſtian* Sabbath,) and the word *Sabbath* indefinitely having been a long time applied to the *Jewiſh* Sabbath, and would be apt to be underſtood of it; therefore (by way of diſtinction) that of the Chriſtians (though a *Sabbath* alſo, within the ſenſe of the Fourth Commandment) was called *the Lords day*, as being the Day or Sabbath appropriate to *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. And therefore when he tells us, ſo often, the World was made by *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, and the Law given on Mount *Sinai* by *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, (upon which Notions he ſeems to lay great ſtreſs, though it be nothing to the purpoſe,) I think it is a miſtake. For *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* is *God and Man*, but he was not *God and Man* when the World was made, or the Law given, but onely *God*. 'Tis true *Chriſt as God*, (according to his Divine Nature) is the ſame *God* who made the World, and gave the Law, (for we have no other *God* but one) but not as *God and Man*. For Man he was not at that time, but in the fulneſs of time *became* Man. The Sabbath *of the Lord our God* (in the fourth Commandment, with equal reſpect to all the Three Perſons) doth not ſignify the ſame as, The Sabbath of *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* (God and Man.) *The Lord our God* there, not the ſame with *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, in the New Teſtament. But Κύριον κυριακὸν (*the Lords Supper*) is the *Supper of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* (God and Man) the Founder of our Chriſtian Religion: And accordingly ἡμέρα κυριακὴ (*the Lords day*) is the *day of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, a day appointed by him.

3. I would have him conſider further, that *the Lords day*, (*dominica*, or *dies dominicus*,) hath been all along, in all ages of the Chriſtian Church, uſed as *the proper name* of what we otherwiſe call the *Chriſtian Sabbath*; and not for the *proper name* of any other day; and therefore, till ſomewhat do appear to the contrary, I ſhall take it to be the ſame with what is called *the Lords day* in Scripture.

There is, in the New Teſtament, a place called *Rome*; and there is at this day a place in *Italy* called *Rome*, and which hath been ſo called all along ever ſince; neither do I know of any other eminent

nent place of called. Therefore (till ſomewhat do appear to the contrary) I ſhall preſume our *Rome* to be the ſame place with that which in the New Teſtament is called *Rome*.

We find in ſcripture there is an Iſland of the Mediterranean Sea called *Melita* or *Malta* (where St. *Paul* ſuffered Ship-wrack) not far from another Iſland called *Crete*: Now we know alſo there is in the Mediterranean Sea an Iſland called *Malta* at this day, and another not far from thence called *Crete* or *Candy*, and we do not know of any other Iſlands ſo called, then, or at any time ſince; and therefore we may ſafely preſume (till ſomewhat do appear to the contrary) that thoſe Iſlands now ſo called, are the ſame Iſlands with thoſe which were then ſo called.

And in like manner, that Day which hath been ever ſince called *the Lords day* as by its *proper name*, we may and ought to preſume to be the ſame day which was by St. *John* ſo called (as by its proper name) in *Rev.* 1. 10. when he wrote the Book of the Revelation; till it can be ſhewed that he did by that name mean ſome other day.

And we have the more reaſon ſo to preſume, becauſe we find it ſo called by others, very ſoon after St. *John*'s time; and by thoſe whom we have great reaſon to believe to have been well acquainted with St. *John*'s meaning and his manner of ſpeech.

The firſt I ſhall name is St. *Ignatius*, who was not onely Contemporary with St. *John*, but was a Diſciple or Scholar of St. *John*. Now St. *John* (according to the beſt account we can have from Chronology) wrote his Revelation in *Patmos* (whither he was baniſhed by *Domitian*,) in or about the year of our Lord 96; (after which he wrote his Goſpel, upon his return from *Patmos* to *Epheſus*:) And Died in the Year 98 or 99 under *Trajanus*. And *Ignatius* died a Martyr under the ſame Emperour *Trajan*, in the Year of our Lord 107. So that there is no great diſtance in time. (And if we ſhould miſs a year or two it is not material.) How long before his death *Ignatius* wrote his Epiſtle to the *Magneſians*, we are not ſure (nor is it material;). Now in that his Epiſtle to the *Magneſians*, even according to the genuine Edition publiſhed by Biſhop *Uſher* out of an ancient Manuſcript (not that which is juſtly ſuſpected to be interpolated,) he doth earneſtly exhort them not to *Judaize*, but to live as *Chriſtians*; (*Si enim uſque nunc ſecundum Judaiſmum vivimus; confitemur gratiam non recepiſſe.*) And as to the Sabbath in particular, *Non amplius Sabbatizantes, ſed ſecundum Dominicam viventes, in qua & vita noſtra orta eſt:*) *Not any longer obſerving the Jewiſh Sabbath, but the Lords Day*

Day on which Chriſt our Life roſe again. It is manifeſt therefore, that within 8 or 10 years after S. *John*'s writing, *the Lords day* did not ſignify the Jewiſh Sabbath, but the *firſt day of the week, on which our Saviour Roſe again;* and that it was then obſerved in contradiſtinction to the Jewiſh Sabbath. I forbear to mention his Epiſtle *ad Trallianos* (where again we have κυριακὴ applied to the firſt day of the week on which Chriſt roſe again) becauſe it is in that Edition which is ſuſpected to be Interpolated.

I might to this add the Teſtimony of *Polycarp*, who was alſo a Diſciple of St. *John*, and collected and publiſhed theſe Epiſtles of *Ignatius;* and may be preſumed to underſtand what St. *John* meant by *the Lords day.*

But I ſhall add in the next place that of *Juſtin Martyr;* whom though I cannot call a *Diſciple* of St. *John*, (becauſe he was not *converted* to the Chriſtian Religion till about the Year of our Lord 129, about Thirty years after St. *John*'s Death,) yet he *lived* ſo ſoon after, that he could not be ignorant of the Chriſtians Practiſe, and what they underſtood St. *John* to mean by *the Lords Day.* And how that day was obſerved in *Juſtin*'s time, he tells us in (what is called) his *Second Apology*, τῇ τῆς ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγρὸς μενόντων ὁ τῶν ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται, and a little after τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέρᾳ, κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα· ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν, ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας, κόσμον ἐποίησε· καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ, τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη. *On that day commonly called Sunday, there is held a Congregation or a general Meeting together, of all Inhabitants whether of City or Country, and there are publickly read the Memorials or Monuments of the Apoſtles, or the Writings of the Prophets,* &c. And again, *The day called Sunday we do all in common make* τὴν συνέλευσιν *the Meeting-day; for that the Firſt-day is it on which God from Darkneſs and Matter made the World, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt did on the ſame day riſe from the dead.* In which places though it be not called *dominica*, but *dies ſolis*, yet how it was then *ſolemnly obſerved*, in memory of our *Lord Chriſts Reſurrection*, is evident.

'Tis manifeſt therefore that *the Lords day* (ἡμέρα κυριακὴ, *Dominica*, or *Dies Dominicus*,) was the *known name* of a day ſo called when St. *John* wrote his *Revelation;* That it was a day of Religious Worſhip contradiſtinguiſhed to that of the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, ſo obſerved and ſo *called* by (St. *John*'s Diſciple) *Ignatius* within 8 or 10 years at moſt after St. *John*'s writing that Book; (Which he would not have done if he had not thought it to be ſo meant by

his Maſter St. *John.*) And in what manner it was obſerved (in their ſolemn religious aſſemblies) *Juſtin Martyr* tells us within 20 years after that; and that it was otherwiſe called (τῇ ἡλίου ἡμέρᾳ) *Sunday*. And that *Dominica* or *Dies Dominicus*, hath been ſo uſed not onely by the Ancient Chriſtian Writers, *Ignatius*, *Clemens*, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Tertullian*, &c. but by the *Councils* and *Church Hiſtory* all along; hath been ſo often ſhewed by divers, and is to be ſeen by any who pleaſe to conſult them, as is not to be doubted by any; unleſs we would (under the notion of *Tradition*) deny all Hiſtory; which in a plain matter of Fact were very unreaſonable. Nor can he ſhew that the name of *the Lords day* ever was (however it might have been as he thinks) attributed to the *Jewiſh* Sabbath. And therefore to tell us that this name is *ſtollen* from the *Jewiſh* Sabbath to be applied to *ours*, is ſuch a Fanſy as may be *laughed at*, but doth not deſerve a ſerious Anſwer. Sure we are that the *Chriſtian* Sabbath hath been long in poſſeſſion of that Name; but, that ever the *Jewiſh* Sabbath was ſo, there is no evidence: Therefore the *Theft* muſt be on his ſide, who *ſteals* it from us to give it to the Jewiſh Sabbath.

But he tells us, that our Saviour himſelf obſerved the Jewiſh Sabbath. (And I ſuppoſe he did ſo. And, that he was Circumciſed alſo, and did obſerve the Ceremonial Law.) But it was before his Death and Reſurrection. I do not find that he obſerved it afterward.

But he ſays, after Chriſts Death when he had ſaid *It is finiſhed, he kept the Sabbath in the Grave.* Be it ſo (if that were *keeping a Sabbath.*) And the good Women *reſted* on that day *according to the Commandment.* And why not? Since Chriſt was not yet riſen; nor was the day yet changed, or pretended ſo to be. This therefore is but Whimſey and nothing to the purpoſe. We all agree; that, till the Reſurrection of Chriſt, the Jews obſerved the Jewiſh Sabbath, on what they called the Seventh-day of their Week. But whether or no it were a Seventh from the Creation, we cannot tell.

'Tis more to the purpoſe what he tells us, that *Paul* and other Chriſtians did after Chriſts Reſurrection ſeem to obſerve the Jewiſh Sabbath; Going to the *Temple* and to the *Synagogues on the Sabbath-day*; meaning thereby the *Jewiſh* Sabbath. And it is true; They did ſo go. But I anſwer;

1. So they did on other days as well as on the Sabbath, and in other places, as well as in the Synagogue and the Temple, *Act* 5. 42. *Dayly in the Temple, and in every houſe*, or *from houſe to houſe* (κατ' οἶκον

(πᾶσάν τε ἡμέραν, ὃν τῷ ἱερῷ ϗ κατ' οἶκον) *they ceaſed not to preach Jeſus Chriſt.* And *Act.* 2. 46. *they continued dayly* καθ' ἡμέραν *with one accord in the Temple,* κλῶντές τε κατ' οἶκον ἄρτον, *and breaking bread at home,* or *from houſe to houſe.* As to ſuch duties of Worſhip as were common to them with the Jews, they took the opportunity of joining therein with them; whether on their Sabbath, or on any other day; but as to what was peculiarly *Chriſtian,* this they performed in ſeparate meetings from them; *breaking their Bread at home,* κατ' οἶκον, or *from houſe to houſe;* The Sacrament of the Lords Supper (being peculiarly a *Chriſtian* ſervice) they did celebrate in their houſes, or ſeparate places of meeting. And ſo we find it at *Troas;* and, *on the firſt day of the week;* Act. 20. 7. *on the firſt day of the week, when the Diſciples were met to break bread,* Paul *preached,* &c. Their meeting for this *Chriſtian ſervice,* was in a ſeparate *place,* and on another *day,* from that of the *Jewiſh* ſervice. And *Paul* at *Athens.* Act. 17. 17. *he diſputed in the Synagogue with the* Jews, *and with the devout perſons, and in the Market, Dayly,* (κατὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν,) He took the opportunity of publick meetings, whether in the Synagogues or elſewhere, whether on the Sabbath or any other day, to preach Chriſt to them, whether Jews or Greeks. Which doth not prove that they did then take the *ſeventh* day to be the *Chriſtian Sabbath;* any more than our going to Hear or Preach a Week-day Lecture, ſuppoſe on *Thurſday,* would prove, that we take *Thurſday* to be *our* Sabbath: or *Paul*'s Preaching on *Mars-hill,* or in the *Market-place,* would prove that he took theſe places to be the Temple or Synagogue. He knew theſe to be Times and Places of concourſe, and therefore took the opportunity of Preaching Then and There; and would ſo have done at any other time and place as there was occaſion: *In ſeaſon or out of ſeaſon,* as he adviſeth *Timothy,* 2 *Tim.* 4. 2.

He doth not deny, *p.* 122. but that *Paul* did *keep the Feaſt* (of the *Paſs-over*) *after the Reſurrection of Chriſt;* Becauſe of what we have *Act.* 18. 21. *He bids them farewel* (at *Epheſus*) ſaying, *I muſt by all means keep this Feaſt that cometh, at* Jeruſalem; *but I will return again unto you, if God will.* Which Feaſt he thinks to be that of the *Paſs-over, though it be not named.* But whether that or whatever Feaſt of the Jews it be, it is all one as to our buſineſs. How great a proof would this have been for the *Seventh-day-Sabbath,* if it had been ſaid *I muſt by all means keep the Sabbath!* 'Tis ſaid indeed, he did *on the Sabbath-day go into the Synagogue,* (but ſo he did on other days,) but not that he *kept* the Sabbath-day; much leſs that *he muſt by all means Keep it.* Or that

he must *by all means* take a journey *from Ephesus to Jerusalem* rather than *not keep* it, though he were *to return thither again*. Yet this Author doth not, for all this think, the Law for the *Jewish Pass-over* to be then in force. But onely that *Paul took occasion to be there at that publick great concourse of People, to preach Christ to the multitude*. For, *that the Apostles were under no obligation to keep that feast of the Pass-over; after the death of Christ, is to him* (he says) *past doubt*. And why may not we say the same of his *going into the Synagogue on the Sabbath day* (rather than miss such an oportunity of a *publick concourse*) which was a less journey than *from Ephesus to Jerusalem?* though *under no obligation to keep the Jewish Sabbath*, more than *to keep the Jews Pass-over*.

2. But I answer further. The Jews who were not Christians, did yet continue to observe the Jewish Sabbath as a matter of duty. And there was no reason why they should not. For, while they did not acknowledge our *Christ* to be the *Messiah*, nor the *Mosaick* Law to be at an end, but Circumcision and the Jewish Oeconomy yet in force, there was no reason why they should not think themselves obliged to the Jewish Sabbath. And many of the *Christian* Jews, who were not yet satisfied of the Abolition of the Mosaick Law, did comply with them therein. For knowing this to have been a law once, and not yet being fully satisfied that it was expired, they were content still to observe it. (And if our Gentleman be of that mind, I would not hinder him, if a Jew, from so doing; but neither would I incourage him.) And I find the Apostles willing to connive at it, and even to countenance it. Not as a thing *necessary*, but at least allowable.

And though they did not think fit to bring a *new Yoke* upon the *Gentiles*, who had not before been obliged to the Jewish Law, (and therefore would not allow the *Gentiles* to be *Circumcised*; as appears by S. *Paul*'s Epistle to the *Galatians*, and the Decrees of the Synod at *Jerusalem*, Act. 15.) yet he allowed the *Jews* to practise it (to whom it had once been a Law) and accordingly *Circumcised Timothy* Act. 16. because, though his Father were a Greek, yet his Mother was a Jew: (but he did not Circumcise *Titus*, *Gal.* 2. 3. for whom there was not the same reason.)

And he did himself comply with the *Jewish* ceremonies; As *Act.* 18. 18. *Having shorn his head in Canchrea; For he had a vow*. And those of *Purification* Act. 21. Not that he thought those Laws now obliging; but, because many of the *believing Jews* were yet *zealous of the Law*, and thought themselves obliged by it, he would not *give offense to them*. For he was satisfied as to himself,

that

that *Circumciſion availeth nothing, nor Uncircumciſion*, 1 Cor. 7. 19. Gal. 6. 15. But was content (till by time and further inſtruction they ſhould be better ſatisfied) that each one ſhould be gratified, as to their own practiſe, according to their own ſentiments, as to things yet diſputable.

And accordingly, as to *eating* or *not eating* things forbidden by *Moſes*'s Law, his adviſe was, to the *Romans*, (many of whom were Jews) *Rom.* 14. 17. *Let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth*, (as breaking a Law which he thinks to be yet in force,) *nor let him that eateth, deſpiſe him that eateth not*, (as a fool that doth not underſtand his own liberty) *for the kingdom of God is not meat and drink*, &c.

And in like manner thoſe at *Jeruſalem* Act. 15. though they did not think fit to bring a *new Yoke* of *Circumciſion* upon the *Gentiles* (to whom before it had not been a Law) yet do adviſe them to forbear *things ſtrangled and bloud*, becauſe this had once been a Law to all the Sons of *Noah*, Gen. 9. 4.

Not but that this was even now antiquated, but (to avoid offenſe) becauſe it had once been a Law. For I take even thoſe things to fall under theſe Generals, *The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteouſneſs and peace and joy in the Holy Ghoſt*, Rom. 14. 17. and *every creature of God is good*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 4. *I know, and am perſwaded that there is nothing unclean of it ſelf*: But *All things indeed are pure*, Rom. 14. 14, 20. Tit. 1. 15. *Meat commendeth us not to God; for neither if we eat, are we the better* (as making uſe of our lawful liberty) *neither if we eat not* (in compliance with thoſe who be unſatisfied) *are we the worſe*, 2 Cor. 8. 8.

So that the Practiſe of the Apoſtles or of the Church at that time, in compliance with the Jews, as to what had before been a Law, but now was not; is no argument that the thing was then obligatory, as before it had been, but only an argument of their condeſcenſion in things of a middle nature, rather than to give offenſe to thoſe who were therein unſatisfied; according to that principle of his *All things are lawful for me but all things are not expedient*, 1 Cor. 10. 23. *To give no offenſe either to Jew or Gentile, or to the Church of God*, ver. 32, 33. *To the Jews I became as a Jew; To the weak I became as weak; I am made all things to all men.*; 1. Cor. 9. 19. In ſo much that even in thoſe things which he knew to be lawful, yet, rather than give offenſe to a weak brother, he would forbear, *If meat make my brother to offend*, (or, be an offenſe to a brother) *I will eat no fleſh while the world ſtandeth, leſt I make my Brother to offend.*

And

And the like I ſuppoſe as to the *Jewiſh* Sabbath; *He that regardeth a day regardeth it to the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks*, Rom, 14. 6. Where 'tis manifeſt that he doth parallel the obſerving or not obſerving a day than queſtionable; with the abſtaining from meats diſputable; that is, from ſuch as before were unlawful, but now ceaſed ſo to be, though all were not yet therein ſatisfied.

And though it be not expreſly ſaid, what was the *Day* thus in queſtion; yet it is moſt likely to be that of the *Jewiſh Sabbath*; For, that the *firſt day of the Week* or *Chriſtian Sabbath* was now obſerved, ſeems very plain: and whether the *Jewiſh Sabbath* ſhould be obſerved alſo, was the queſtion. And thoſe who were for continuing *Circumciſion* and the *Moſaick* Ceremonies, were doubtleſs for that alſo. And the Apoſtles Rule was for a mutual condeſcenſion (as to the Jews) for each to follow their own ſentiments therein, without cenſuring one another.

But as to the Gentiles, he ſeems to be of another mind; And therefore to the *Galatians*, who were moſt of them *Gentile-Chriſtians*, he would not ſo much as *allow* the practiſe of *Circumciſion* (which to the Jews he did;) and tells them that *if they be Circumciſed Chriſt profiteth them nothing*; and *he that is Circumciſed is debtor to the whole Law*, Gal. 5. 2, 3. For it was a renouncing Chriſt who had made them Free; putting themſelves under the Jewiſh Yoke, to which (even before) they were not ſubject.

And therefore to theſe he ſpeaks more warmly, *Gal.* 1. 6, 7. *I marvel that you are ſo ſoon removed from him that called you into the grace of Chriſt, unto another Goſpel: Which is not another*, (or, *there being no other Goſpel* ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, where as there is not any other Goſpel;) *onely there be ſome that trouble you, and would pervert the Goſpel of Chriſt.* And ſuch are thoſe who would bring on them a *new Yoke*, (by making that a *Duty* which God had not made ſo.) Where he preſſeth them to keep cloſe to the Goſpel of Chriſt, as by him delivered (without any connexion of *Moſes*'s Law,) there being indeed *no other Goſpel* but that; and they who teach them otherwiſe, *do pervert the Goſpel*; the true Goſpel of Chriſt, including no obligation to the Jewiſh Law; either as to *Circumciſion* or the *difference of meats*, or other particulars of that Law; as he argues, in the ſecond, third and fourth Chapters, ſhewing that even thoſe who were before under it, are now freed

from

from it, and they much more who were never under it. And thereupon *Chap.* 4. 9,10, 11. he rebukes them severely, that *after they had known God* (*or rather were known of God*) *they should turn again to the weak and beggarly rudiments* or *elements. Ye observe* (saith he) *days and months and times and years, I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.*

'Tis not indeed here said in particular, what those *days* were, that are here meant; yet it is most likely (and scarce to be doubted) to be meant of the *Jewish Sabbath.* For though other Observation of Times be here reckoned up (there being the same reason of all) yet there was no *occasion* for the *others*, in *Galatia.* For the Jews themselves did not think themselves obliged (nor do the Jews at this day) to the observation of their *other* Feasts or Fasts out of their own land. But to that of *Circumcision*, and of the *Jewish Sabbath*, and the distinction of *Meats*, they thought themselves obliged even out of their own land. And of such we must understand this to the *Galatians.* These being the things there in question; not those other, which were confined to the land of *Canaan.*

But he objects here, that though *Days* be mentioned, yet not *Sabbath-days*; and fansies it might be meant of some *other* days; not of *Sabbaths.* To gratify him therefore in this also, I will proceed to that of *Colos.* 2. 16. Where *Sabbaths* are *expresly named.*

To the *Colossians*, who were also Christian *Gentiles*, he pursues the same notions; *Least any one should beguile them with inticing words*, Col. 2. 4. (thereby to bring them under the *Mosaick* Law:) He bids them *Beware lest any spoil them through Philosophy and vain deceit.* Whereby, I suppose, he means the Mosaick doctrines or Philosophy of the Jews, (which *Clemens Alexandrinus* doth all along call φιλοσοφίαν βαρβάρον in contradistinction to that of the Greeks,) *after the traditions of men, after the rudiments* (or *elements*) *of the world, and not after Christ*, ver. 8. and that particularly of *Circumcision* ver. 11. (in the room of which, *Baptism* is come; *ver.* 12.) Christ, by his Death *having blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances* (meaning the Jewish Law) *and took it out of the way, nailing it to his Cross*, ver. 14. and (amongst other things) *Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink* (as if some were now *clean* others *unclean*, as under the Mosaick Law,) *or in respect of an holy day*, (ἑορτῆς a *Festival*) *or of the new Moon, or of the Sabbath days*; ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων, ver. 16. Where by *Sabbath* must be meant the *Jewish Sabbath*; the day which in common speech was understood by the word *Sabbath.*

For

For this, he hath two or three evaſions. He doth commonly preſs hard in other places, that by *Sabbath* is to be underſtood the Jews *Seventh-day-Sabbath*, and *no other day*. *(The holy Spirit doth call the Seventh-day, the Sabbath, (and no other day of the week) both in the Old and in the New Teſtament throughout*, p. 46. And, I think, he is not much out therein; that it doth, uſually, ſo ſignify where it doth not come with ſome intimation to direct us to ſome other ſenſe. And why it ſhould not be thought ſo to ſignify here, I ſee no reaſon. For though I take our *Chriſtian Sabbath* to fall as properly under the word *Sabbath* in the Fourth Commandment, as that of the *Jews*; yet the word, in common uſe, having by this time become the *proper name* of that Day which the Jews ſo called, it was neceſſary (to avoid confuſion) to give the Chriſtian Sabbath another name; as that of *the Lords-Day*, or the *firſt day of the week*. And conſequently that the *Sabbaths* here mentioned, are to be underſtood (according to the then uſe of the word) of *thoſe* Sabbaths. Not as if all days of *Holy Reſt* where hereby forbidden; but onely the nicety of *confining* it particularly to that day which was then (in common ſpeech) ſo called.

But he would not have it *here* underſtood of the *Seventh-day* Sabbath (as every where elſe) but ſome other *Ceremonial Sabbaths*; but what thoſe are, he doth not tell us.

That there were ſome other *Feaſts* obſerved by the Jews, which, in the Old Teſtament, are ſometimes called *Sabbaths* (but very ſeldome,) I do not deny: nor that thoſe come under the general Words in this place. But thoſe do not ſeem to be here principally intended, becauſe it is manifeſt to be underſtood of the Sabbath *there* in diſpute. Now there was no occaſion of a diſpute concerning the obſervance of thoſe *other Sabbaths*, amongſt the Gentiles, out of the *Holy-land*. Theſe obſervations being not thought obligatory, even to the Jews, but in their own Land onely. And it is expreſly provided, *Deut.* 16. that theſe were not to be kept in any place promiſcuouſly; *not within any of the Gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee; But in the place which the Lord thy God ſhall chuſe to place his name there*. So of the *Paſs-over*, ver. 5, 6. So of the Feaſt of *Pentecoſt*, ver. 11. So of the Feaſt of *Tabernacles*, ver. 15. And of altogether, *ver.* 16. And therefore, not out of their own Land. I do not deny but that they might, in private houſes, *eat the Paſchal Lamb*, (as Chriſt did, with his Diſciples,) but not *Sacrifice* the Paſs-over. For it was to be *ſacrificed* in the *Temple* onely; and the *Feaſt of the Paſs-*

Paſs-over to be *there* ſolemnly kept. Not in private houſes; and much leſs *out of their own Land.*

Nor do I remember, that any where in all the New Teſtament, the word *Sabbath* is uſed for any *ſuch* Sabbaths: Nor can reaſonably be ſuppoſed to be here meant of thoſe *Feaſts*, becauſe it is put in contradiſtinction to them. *Let no man judge you in reſpect of a Feaſt, of the New-moon, or of the Sabbaths.* Which yet I do not underſtand as if *no* Sabbath might now be kept, but that the Obligation to *that* Sabbath was now at an end.

Another evaſion is this, He would have σαββάτων (*Sabbata*) in the plural number, to ſignify *Weeks*, not *Sabbath-days*. The *Sabbath-day* being called, in the ſingular number, σάββατον (*Sabbatum.*) For he will rather play at ſmall game than ſtand out. If we ſhould allow him this, it would not advance his purpoſe at all. For if the buſineſs of *Weeks* be at an end, (that we are no longer to diſtribute our time into *Weeks*,) than that of the *Sabbath* much more, which he would have to be the ſeventh day of the *Week*.

But ſuppoſe we do allow that *one* Sabbath is to be called *Sabbatum* what are we to call *two* or *more* Sabbaths? Muſt not they be *Sabbata?* And if this be his meaning, then are we not to obſerve ſuch *Sabbaths* any longer.

But what muſt we then ſay to *Mat.* 28. 1. ὀψὲ σαββάτων, which we render *In the end of the Sabbath*, meaning thereby the *Seventh day Sabbath* then paſt, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, *as it began to draw towards the firſt day of the Week:* muſt we read it, *at the end the Sabbaths* (becauſe σαββάτων is in the plural number,) *when the Sabbaths* (meaning the *Seventh-day* Sabbaths) *were now at an end, and the Firſt-day Sabbath coming on in their place?* If that reading pleaſe him; it will ſerve us as well.

But he is miſtaken in his criticiſm. 'Tis true that σαββάτων in the plural number ſeems to be ſometime put for *a Week* (but not *Weeks*, that I know of, as he would have it.) And ſo it is commonly taken to be where we find μία σαββάτων, for *the firſt day of the Week* (but may as well be rendered, *the firſt day after the Sabbath.*) And ſo is σάββατον in the ſingular, as *Luke* 18. 12. νηστεύω δὶς τοῦ σαββάτου, *I faſt twice in the week*, I ſuppoſe he would not have us render it *I faſt twice on the Sabbath day* (though it be in the ſingular number,) as if he did *faſt twice* upon *one day.* But thus rather, *I keep two Faſts to one Sabbath*; which is the ſame in ſenſe with, *I faſt twice in the Week.* In like manner as the *Olympiad*, may be taken ſometime for that particular year on which were the *Olympick Games* (which were wont to return

every *fifth year* inclusively, that is, as we use to speak the *fourth year after* the last *Olympick*;) sometime for the *interval of four years* from the end of one Olympick to the end of the next following. So here, *Sabbatum* may be sometime taken strictly for the *Sabbath-day*; and sometime for the whole *septiduum* or *week* from Sabbath to Sabbath.

And so is *Sabbata* (in the plural number) taken also for a *Sabbath-day*; Thus I take it to be here, (*Mat.* 28. 1.) ὀψὲ σαββάτων when the *Sabbath-day* was ended; in the same sense with that of *Mark* 16. 1. διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου (speaking of the very same time) *when the Sabbath was past*. And in like manner, *Matth.* 12. 1. *At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath day through the Corn*, τοῖς σάββασι (*Sabbatis*) in the plural number. And so it is in *Mark* 2. 23. ἐν τοῖς σάββασι. Yet it is meant but of *one* day, as appears by the parallel place (where the same is again related) *Luk.* 6. 1. ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ. And so *Mat.* 12. 5, 10, 12. *Mar.* 3. 4. *Luk.* 4. 31. *Luk.* 6. 2, 9. And σάββατα in the Septuagint is commonly put for the *Sabbath-day*. I will not say *Allways* (because I have not examined it) but in all the places which I consulted. And even in the body of the Ten Commandments *Exod.* 20. 8. μνήσθητι τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων. (*Remember the day of the Sabbaths*; in the plural number.) And again ver. 10. τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ σάββατα τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου (*but the seventh day Sabbaths to the Lord thy God*;) So *Ex.* 16. 13. σάββατα ἀναπαύσεως ἁγία τῷ κυρίῳ αὔριον. (*the Sabbaths a holy Rest unto the Lord, to morrow.*) And *Levit.* 23. 3. *six days shall work be done, but the seventh is* σάββατα *the Sabbaths of Rest; ye shall do no work therein*, σάββατά ἐστι τῷ κυρίῳ *it is the Sabbaths of the Lord*. Which are the signal places wherein the Sabbath is commanded. And the like very often (if not always) in the Septuagint, whose language the New Testament doth usually follow. So that his criticism comes to nothing, but only to shew how *careless* he is of *what* he says if at least he may seem to say *somewhat*. (Such is that when he tells us *p.* 136. that *God who hath reserved a Tenth of our Substance, hath reserved But a Seventh of Time*. As though he thought a *tenth part* to be more than a *seventh part*. And many such negligences, which I spare to mention.)

But whether we render it *Sabbath-day* or *Sabbath-days* the sense is still the same. And the Apostles design in all these places seems to be this, that though to the *Jews*, to whom it had once been a Law, he doth allow a liberty (till they should be better satisfied) for each to follow his own judgment (without censuring others) as well in this of the *Jewish Sabbath*, as in the business of *Circumcision*, and the abstinence from *Meats*, and their other *Rites*;

yet

yet he would by no means ſuffer theſe to be brought upon the *Gentiles* as a *new Yoke* to which before they had not been ſubject.

I ſay as a *new Yoke* to which they had not been ſubject. For though I do admit that by natural light, or the Law of *Nature*, man ought to allow a *competent time* for the ſolemn ſervice of God; and, by a *poſitive* Law, that it ſhould be at leaſt *one day in ſeven*, that is, *after ſix days of Labour*, the *ſeventh* to be a day of *Reſt*; and ſo much to be intended in the *Fourth Commandment*. Yet, I do not think it to be ſo determined to *this* day in order, as to be unchangable to after Ages.

We can be no ways ſure, that the *ſeventh* day in order from the firſt raining of *Manna*, Ex. 16. was the *ſeventh* in order from the *Creation*. And as they did obſerve it then in order from thence; ſo when *Chriſt*, or his Apoſtles by direction from him, did put it into a new order, this new order doth as well ſute the words of the Fourth Commandment as that former.

I do the rather ſay that this to the Gentiles is a *new Yoke*, becauſe I find this to be given as a *ſign*, a *covenant*, or diſtinctive *mark* given to the Jews, as Gods *peculiar People*, in contradiſtinction to other Nations; juſt as *Circumciſion* was. So *Exod.* 31. 13. *My Sabbaths ye ſhall keep, for it is a Sign between me and you throughout your generations*, and ver. 16. *The Children of Iſrael ſhall keep the Sabbath, to obſerve the Sabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual Covenant*, and ver. 17. *It is a Sign between me and the Children of Iſrael for ever*. So Ezek. 20. 12. *I gave them my Sabbaths to be a Sign between me and them;* and *ver.* 20. *They ſhall be a Sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God*. Juſt as it is ſaid of *Circumciſion*, Gen. 17. 7. *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between me and thee* (ſaith God to *Abraham*) *and thy ſeed after thee, for an Everlaſting Covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy ſeed after thee:* and *ver.* 10, 11. *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy ſeed after thee, every male-child among you ſhall be Circumciſed, and it ſhall be a Token of the Covenant between me and you:* and *ver.* 13. *My Covenant ſhall be in your fleſh an everlaſting Covenant*, (not as if *Circumciſion* were to be *for ever* obligatory; but *rebus ſic ſtantibus*, ſo long as things continued in that eſtate.) And ſo it is called *Rom.* 4. 11. *He received the Sign of Circumciſion, a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith*. And ſuch was the *Bloud of the Paſchal Lamb on the Door-poſts of the houſe*, Ex. 12. 7. to be a *diſtinctive mark* between the *Iſraelites* and the *Egyptians*; as *ver.* 13. *The bloud ſhall be to you for a Token upon the houſes where you are, and when I ſee the bloud*

I will paſs over you. And ſo *Ex.* 11.5,6,7. *That ye may know how that the Lord doth put a Diſtinction between the Egyptians and Iſrael.*

And our Author himſelf, *pag.* 26. doth preſs the ſame, and puts great weight upon it, that *this Seventh-day-ſabbath is often called a Sign for ever between him and them, and a perpetual Covenant, to Diſtinguiſh his people from others;* that is, the people of the Jews from other Nations. And ſo to be *a Sign for Ever*, as Circumciſion is an *Everlaſting Covenant.*

Now whatſoever was a *Diſtinctive Mark* of the People of *Iſrael*, from other *Nations*, as was that of *Circumciſion*, the *Paſs-over*, and the *Seventh-day-ſabbath*, was at an end and to ceaſe when *the partition-wall was broken down* between Jew and Gentile, when Chriſt had *made both one*, and *aboliſhed in his fleſh the Enmity*, (*even the law of Commandments contained in Ordinances,*) *to make of twain One new man; to reconcile both in One body by the Croſs, having ſlain the Enmity thereby*, Eph. 2. 14, 15, 16. Or as it is Col. 2. 14. *Having blotted out the hand-writing of Ordinances which was againſt us, and was contrary to us*, (as ſeparating us Gentiles from the Jews, and ſo excluding us out of Gods Viſible Church,) *and nailing it to his Croſs.* From whence he there infers, *ver.* 16. *Let no man Therefore judge you in meat or drink, or in reſpect of a holy-day* (a Feſtival) *or of Sabbaths*, (the proper name, at that time, of the *Seventh-day* Sabbath:) *which things are a ſhadow of things to come, but the body is of Chriſt;* theſe being but *ſhadows* or empty things, whereas it is the *body*, (the Subſtance) that Chriſt regards. ἃ ἐστι σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, thoſe are but *ſhadow*, but 'tis the *Body* that Chriſt looks at. That is (in our language) thoſe are only *Circumſtantials*, but 'tis *ſubſtance* or the *Subſtantials* of Religion that *Chriſt* and *Chriſtianity* reſpects. And, as it is meerly *Circumſtantial* (and doth not at all influence Religion) whether in the *Temple* or other *place* God be worſhiped (*Joh.* 4. 21.) So, whether on *this* or *another* day, a Sabbath be kept.

If therefore thoſe Sabbaths (as is ſhewed) were diſtinctive *Marks* or *Signs* of Gods peculiar *Covenant* or *Contract* with the Church of *Iſrael* as *their peculiar God*, in contradiſtinction to other Nations; then 'tis manifeſt that thoſe other Nations did not at all keep a *Sabbath*, or not on *that Day;* (elſe how could this be a diſtinctive Mark?) and therefore to bring this now upon the Gentiles, was to bring upon them a *new Yoke.*

I add further, that this *Jewiſh* Sabbath (as is ſhewed before) ſeems to be, not a Continuation of a former Sabbath from the Creation, (which I doubt was either not obſerved at all, or had long

long before this time been forgot,) but rather a New Inſtitution or Reſtitution after their coming out of *Egypt* (from a new *Epocha*) at *Marah*; where God is ſaid to have *made a Statute and an Ordinance*, Exod. 15. 25. to which *Commandment and Statute if they would hearken diligently and give Ear, he would not bring upon them the Diſeaſes which he had brought upon* Egypt, *For* (ſaith he) *I am the Lord that healeth thee*, ver. 26. Whereupon follows (in the next Chapter) a *Sabbath* to be obſerved on the *ſeventh-day* from the firſt raining of *Manna*, (not from the firſt Creation.) And with reference to their *Reſt* or *Refreſhing* after their *Labour* or *Bondage* in *Egypt*; (as was that of the *Paſs-over*, to their being *paſſed-over*, when the firſt-born of the *Egyptians* were ſlain.) For ſo he ſaith, *Exod.* 31. 13. *My Sabbath ſhall ye keep, for it is a Sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth ſanctifiy you* (or ſeparate you to my ſelf as a peculiar people, a holy people;) and *ver.* 16, 17. *The Children of Iſrael ſhall keep my Sabbaths* (מִשְׁבָּתוֹת) *for a perpetual Covenant; It is a Sign between Me and the Children of Iſrael for ever; for in ſix days the Lord made Heaven and Earth, and on the Seventh Day he Reſted and was Refreſhed.* Not that God was *Wearied* with his *Work*, and needed *Refreſhment*; but he doth parallel his *Reſt* after his *Work* of Creation, with their *Refreſhment* after their *Labour* in *Egypt*.

And that God had a particular reſpect to *their Reſt and Refreſhment* from their *Labour and Bondage in Egypt*; is farther evident, not onely from the General *Preface* to all the Commandments, (*I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the houſe of Bondage;*) but from the Cloſe of this *Fourth* Commandment, as it is repeated in *Deut.* 5. 12, 13, 14, 15. (ſomewhat different from what is in *Exod.* 20.) where, (inſtead of *For in ſix days the Lord made Heaven and Earth*, &c. *Exod.* 20. 11.) we have (*Deut.* 5. 15.) *And remember that thou waſt a ſervant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and a ſtretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day.* Which ſhews that *this* Sabbath, had a particular reſpect to *that deliverance*.

Now as God by *Moſes* did, upon a New occaſion (of their Reſt from their Labour in *Egypt*) give a New *Epocha* or Beginning to a Circulation of Sabbaths, to be reckoned from thence, in *imitation* of his own Reſting from the Work of Creation; Not by the Fourth Commandment (for that ſpeaks indifferently as to any Circulation,) but by this *Ordinance* at *Marah*, or at *Elim* (for 'tis this de-

determines the Circulation to the *ſeventh* day after the raining of *Manna;)* So might Chriſt as well (by himſelf or his Apoſtles) fix another *Epocha* from his *Reſurrection;* (as we have reaſon to think he did;) and this Equally within the proſpect of the Fourth Commandment. This *Reſt* from the *Egyptian Bondage*, being as much a *ſhadow*, of what Chriſt regards as the *ſubſtance;* as was the eſcaping of the Egyptian *Deſtruction*, of which the *Paſs-over* was the Memorial. And accordingly this *Circulation* equally to ceaſe with that of the Paſs-over, at the coming of Chriſt; notwithſtanding the continuance of the *Fourth Commandment*, in a *New* Circulation from another *Epocha*. It is not indeed *expreſly ſaid* that Chriſt *Bid* his *Apoſtles* ſo to do: But as *Moſes* is preſumed to do what he did by *Gods* direction; ſo the *Apoſtles* by *Chriſts* direction; to whom he gave *Commandments* for that purpoſe, *Act.* 1. 2, 3.

As to what he ſays ſo often; that not one *Jott* or *Tittle* of the *Law* (meaning that of the Decalogue) is *deſtroyed*, but doth ſtill continue in force: This, as to the *ſubſtance of the Duty*, I grant. But if his meaning be, that there is not a *Word* or *Letter* therein which doth not as *literally* belong to *Us* Now, as it did Then to *Iſrael:* I cannot aſſent to it. For it cannot be ſaid of all Us who are under that Law, that God hath *Brought us out of the land of Egypt, out of the houſe of Bondage;* or that *We* are to expect *long life, in the land* (of Canaan) *which he Gave Them.*

If he ſay that our deliverance from *ſpiritual bondage* is equivalent to theirs from *Egypt*, and *our land* the ſame to us as *Canaan* was to them: I grant it. But ſo is our *Lords Day* equivalent to their *Seventh-day-ſabbath*, and Chriſt the *true Manna* (more than) equivalent to that of theirs, from the *raining* of which they reckoned their *Jewiſh* Sabbaths.

As to what he ſays of *Mat.* 24. 20. *Pray that your flight be not in the Winter, nor on the Sabbath-day;* which he thinks to be underſtood of the *Jewiſh* Sabbath, 38 years after Chriſts Reſurrection. Perhaps it may. For the obſtinate Jews, (who *would not in their day underſtand the things that belonged to their peace*, but rejected Chriſt,) did no doubt continue to obſerve their Jewiſh Sabbath, and thought themſelves obliged ſo to do: And it would then be as great an *Affliction* to them, as if *their* Sabbath were yet in force: But no more a *ſin* to fly on that day, than to fly in the *Winter*. It would be ſo to the *Chriſtians*, if put to flight on the *Chriſtian* Sabbath (for the caſe would be the like of both) and they might as well *Pray againſt it:* That is, Againſt *their* Flight

on

on the *Chriſtian* Sabbath; as the *Jews* on the *Jewiſh* Sabbath. This therefore makes nothing at all to his purpoſe. He might as well argue from hence, that it were a *ſin* to *labour* in *Winter*; as, on the *Jewiſh Sabbath*.

He hath many other little excurſions, as little to the purpoſe, with which I ſhall not trouble my ſelf or you; having fully anſwered what ſeems to me to have any appearance of Argument.

But he takes great pleaſure to expoſe the Name of *Sunday*. Yet I do not find any more fond of uſing it, than he. Not, that he would be thought to *like* the Word, but becauſe he thinks it a *Reproach*. If he do not like that name, he may call it as we do, the *Lords Day*, the *Chriſtian Sabbath*, or (if he think theſe too good names for it) he may call it the *Firſt day of the Week*.

But why not as angry with the *Monday*? or other of the Week days? If on *Monday* the Heathens (as he would have us think) did worſhip the *Moon*, as the *Sun* on *Sunday*, why is he not as angry with that? It is as much Idolatry to worſhip the *Moon* on Monday, as the *Sun* on Sunday. True. But that doth not concern the *Chriſtians* Sabbath (which is what he hath a mind to reproach) and therefore he ſpeaks little of the other, and but ſeldome: But *Sunday* is to be ſnubbed upon every occaſion.

He would not have a *Sabbath* upon *Sunday*, becauſe he ſays, on that day they worſhiped the *Sun*. But why upon *Saturday* if on that day (as he would have us think) they worſhiped *Saturn*?

Now 'tis true that ſome of the Heathen did worſhip the *Sun*, and the *Moon*, and *the Hoſt of Heaven*. But that they did worſhip the *Sun* more upon *Sunday*, than they did upon *Monday* or *Tueſday*, is more than I know, or he can prove. He tells us, *Verſtegan* ſays, that the *Heathen Saxons* did ſo. But *Verſtegan* is too young an Author to ſettle this upon his own Authority; unleſs he can bring Vouchers for it more ancient than himſelf. It was, I ſuppoſe, a Fanſy of *Verſtegan* Then (as it is of our Author Now;) But I do not remember that he cites any Author ancienter than himſelf. And though ſome others may ſay the like; Yet I look upon it but as a *plauſible conjecture*, without any good foundation in Hiſtory. And even the *Heathen Saxons* are too late for his purpoſe.

He tells us, *p.* 88. *The Heathen Nations long before Chriſts Birth did offer Sacrifice to the Sun, and worſhip it as a God upon Sunday.* His proof is from *Job* 31. 26, 27, 28. *If I beheld the Sun when it ſhined, or the Moon walking in brightneſs, and my heart hath been ſecretly enticed, or my mouth hath kiſſed my hand, this were an iniquity to be puniſhed by the Judges for I ſhould have denied the Lord above.*

But

But what is all this to Sunday? It may perhaps be a diſclaimer of *worſhiping the Sun;* but ſays nothing of *Sunday*.

Doth our Author think the name of *Sunday* to be as old as *Job*'s times? If *Job* had ſaid, *If I have worſhiped the Sun upon Sunday, or the Moon upon Monday, and not the Lord upon Saturday;* it had been to his purpoſe: But here is nothing of that. Not a word of *what day* it was on which they worſhiped the Sun.

But I would not have him lay too great a load upon *Sunday*. For *Heſiod* tells us (as was ſaid before) that in his time (one of the oldeſt of the Heathen Writers, though younger than *Job*) the *Seventh* day was *Sun-day*, not the *Firſt*. And he hath nothing to ſhew (more than the bare *Name* of *Sunday*) to make us believe that thoſe of the Heathen, who worſhiped the Sun, did confine that worſhip to *this* day of the Week; or, Did more worſhip it on this day than on others.

I do not certainly know how Ancient thoſe Names are of *Saturday, Sunday, Monday*, &c. nor upon what occaſion they were firſt taken up, (nor is it much to our purpoſe.)

The moſt ancient Heathen Writer whom I know to have mentioned them is *Dio Caſſius*, who lived about the Year of our Lord 230. Who ſpeaking of the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* and the *Temple*, tells us that the *Jews* had ſuch a reverence for *Saturn's day*, as that they would not *Labour* on that day for their Defenſe; which the *Romans* underſtanding, did on that day aſſault them, and prevailed. (Againſt their *Temple* and *Sabbath* both at once.) Not as if the *Jews* did then call it *Saturn*'s day, (nor am I ſure that any other did then ſo call it,) for they called it their *Sabbath*-day; But it was that day of the Week which, in *Dio*'s time, was called *Saturday*.

But *Dio* ſpeaks of it as a *new Thing* ſo to call the Days of the Week, and which the *Ancient Greeks* (he tells us) knew not. ('Twas therefore not very Ancient.) And therefore he ſuppoſeth the *Romans* to have taken it up from the *Egyptians*. Not the Old *Egyptians* of *Moſes*'s time, but rather from thoſe about the time of *Ptolomy;* not of King *Ptolomy*, but of *Claudius Ptolomæus* the Aſtronomer (or perhaps ſomewhat earlier) when Aſtronomy there flouriſhed, and from whom the *Romans* had it.

In a Chriſtian Writer, I find it earlier than *Dio;* in *Juſtin Martyr*'s Apology, written about the Year of Chriſt 150. who mentions τῆ ἡλίε ἡμέρᾳ, the *Day of the Sun*, as the Chriſtian Sabbath. And *Tertullian* in his *Apology*, mentions *Saturday* and *Sunday*. And it may perhaps be found in Writers earlier than theſe, Though I do not at preſent meet with it. Nor do I think it worth

worth the while to make any great ſearch about it. I grant, that when Chriſtianity was ſpread among the Gentiles; and, with it, the Chriſtian Sabbath; they did (in order to the obſerving that Sabbath) diſtinguiſh their time into *Weeks;* and thereupon gave Names to each Day. I grant alſo that the *Jews* did, before, ſo diſtinguiſh their Time: but I do not find that any other Nation did ſo. If any think, that All nations did ſo diſtinguiſh, and every Nation, all the World over, call the days by thoſe Names by which they are now called: This I take to be but a *Preſumption*, without proof.

But when ever thoſe names were firſt taken up, I do not think they were taken from the *number of their Gods* (for then they muſt have had a great many more days in their Week than Seven, if each of their Gods muſt have a peculiar day:) But from the number of the *Planets*, which were then reckoned to be *Seven*, and in this order *Saturn*, *Jupiter*, *Mars*, *Sol*, *Venus*, *Mercury*, *Luna*. Though we now know the Planets to be more than Seven. (For the *Satellites* of *Jupiter* and *Saturn* are as much *Planets* as our *Moon;* but were not then known.) Nor were the Seven Planets always reckoned in the ſame order; but ſome had been thought to be *above* the Sun, which, before theſe names were given, were accounted to be *below* it. And therefore theſe Names muſt be at leaſt ſo late. And certainly not ſo old as *Job*'s time.

I take them not to be older than what are called the *Planetary Hours*, but to take their Riſe from thence, and the Order of the Names to be thence determined. For having divided the Day into 24 Hours; Beginning with *Saturn*, the higheſt of the Planets, they aſſigned to him the *Firſt* hour of one day, which thence they called *Saturn*'s day; the Second hour to *Jupiter*, the Third to *Mars*, and ſo in order till they came to the Eighth hour which falls to *Saturn*'s turn again, and ſo again to the Fifteenth, and the Two and Twentieth; and then the Three and Twentieth to *Jupiter*, the Four and Twentieth to *Mars*, and the next hour, being the firſt of the next day, to *Sol*. Which day doth thence take the name of *Sol* or *Sunday* (next in order after *Saturn*.) And, in like manner proceeding, the Eighth, Fifteenth, and Two and Twentieth hour of that day will fall again to *Sol*, the Three and Twentieth to *Venus*, the Four and Twentieth to *Mercury;* and then the firſt hour of the next day to *Luna*, thence called *Monday* (next after *Sunday*.) And, in like manner, the firſt hour of the following day to *Mars;* of the next to *Mercury;* the next to *Jupiter*, the next to *Venus;* and then again to *Saturn;* and ſo onward as before. And this I

take to be the true account of thoſe Names, and in that Order: *Saturday*, *Sunday*, *Monday*, after which (in the Latine Denomination) follow the days of *Mars*, *Mercury*, *Jupiter*, and *Venus*.

But ſome of our Anceſtors the Saxons, thought fit (as is ſuppoſed) to put-in the Names of *Twiſco*, *Woden*, *Thor*, *Frea*, (ſome of their Princes) inſtead of *Mars*, *Mercury*, *Jupiter*, and *Venus*, (as *Julius* and *Auguſtus*, amongſt the *Romans*, gave their Names to the Months formerly called *Quintilis* and *Sextilis*.) From which Saxon Princes we have the Names of *Tueſday*, *Wedneſday*, *Thurſday* and *Fryday*: the other days retaining the Names of their reſpective Planets as they did before.

This account (from the order of the Planetary Hours) *Dio* gives us of the *Names* of the Week-days, and of their *Order*. Why ſo called, and why in this Order.

He tells us of another account from the Principles of *Harmonicks*. Becauſe *Dia-teſſaron* (which we call a *Fourth*) is Reputed a *Concord* in Muſick; therefore they might, beginning with *Saturn* (skipping two, *Jupiter* and *Mars*,) take the Fourth *Sol*: then (skipping the two next *Venus* and *Mercury*) take *Luna*: And then (skipping *Saturn* and *Jupiter*) take *Mars*: Then (skipping *Sol* and *Venus*) take *Mercury*: Then (skipping *Luna* and *Saturn*) take *Jupiter*: Then (skipping *Mars* and *Sol*) take *Venus*: Then (skipping *Mercury* and *Luna*) take *Saturn*; and ſo onward as before. But this account ſeems more *Forced*, and the former more *Natural*. Which therefore I take to be the true ground of this Order.

But either way, depending upon the order of the Planets as they were then accounted when theſe Names were given to the Week-days, it is at leaſt ſo far evident that they cannot be older than ſince the Planets were accounted to be placed in this order. And therefore not ſo old as when *Venus* or *Mercury* or both of them were thought to be above the *Sun*. (For this would quite diſturb the Order.) And therefore, certainly, not ſo old as *Job*'s time.

Whether on each of theſe *Days* they did worſhip thoſe reſpective *Planets*, as ſo many *Gods*, I cannot ſay; nor do I think it.

Nor do I think that each of thoſe *Planets* have any more *Government* of their reſpective *Hours*, or *Days*, than of others. For I take the whole foundation as well of *Theſe*, as of the other parts of *Judicial Aſtrology*, to be purely *Precarious*; and aſſigned onely at pleaſure, by thoſe whoſe buſineſs it was to amuſe credulous people, and thereby to make a Gain of them.

But,

But, whatever were the occaſion of the firſt impoſing; theſe are now the known Names of thoſe days. (And we need no more ſcruple the uſe of theſe *Names;* than to talk of Pope *Pius*, *Clemens*, *Boniface*, and *Innocent;* though poſſibly the Perſons ſo called, had none of thoſe good Qualities.) In like manner as we have a Spring near *Oxford* which we call *Ariſtotle's Well;* not that we think *Ariſtotle* was ever there, or was *Lord* of the place, and much leſs that he was wont to be *there Worſhiped;* but we ſo call it as being now the *proper name* of the place (impoſed at pleaſure) by which it is known. And ſo for the days of the Week; whatever were the occaſion of the firſt impoſing, they now ſignify no more than the proper diſtinctive names by which the days are known.

And why we may not continue ſo to call them, I know not. We are told *Act.* 17. 19, 22. of *Paul's* being at *Areopagus* or *Mars-hill*, becauſe that was the known name of the place, without ſcrupling the reaſon why it was ſo called (whether, becauſe *Mars* had been there worſhiped, or for what other reaſon.) And *Act.* 28. 11. of a *Ship* deſigned by *Caſtor* and *Pollux*, or Διόσκουροι, without ſcrupling the reaſon of that name, or what relation theſe Stars had to *Jupiter*, ſo as to be called *his Lads.* And when *Paul* 1 *Cor.* 8. allows them without Scruple to *eat of things offered in Sacrifice to Idols*, even though they knew, or had reaſon to preſume them ſo to be, (unleſs when they might be ſuſpected to do it with reſpect to the Idol) as the Apoſtle argues at large 1 *Cor.* 8. and again *Chap.* 10. No doubt we may as lawfully make uſe of proper Names (whereby perſons, times, or places be commonly known) without ſcrupling the occaſion of their firſt impoſition.

And I would deſire thoſe Gentlemen (who are ſo over ſcrupulous where there is no juſt occaſion, and make it their buſineſs to throw Scruples and caſt Stumbling-blocks before others,) to conſider ſeriouſly, whoſe Work they be doing all that while; and whether it be not as truly and properly *ſuperſtition* to repreſent and quarel with things as unlawful and ſinful, which in their own nature are not ſo; as it is to introduce things under a pretence of *holineſs* which have in them no ſuch thing. And whether this be not to *dote about queſtions and ſtrife of words:* Whether theſe be not of thoſe *fooliſh and unlearned queſtions* which we are adviſed to *avoid; knowing that they gender ſtrifes;* and to *avoid fooliſh queſtions, and genealogies and contentions about the law, for they are unprofitable and vain;* and inſtead thereof to mind thoſe things that are *good and profitable to men; to follow righteouſneſs, faith, charity, peace*, &c. as we are directed, 1 *Tim.* 6. 4, 5. 2 *Tim.* 2. 22, 23. *Tit.* 3. 8, 9.

They do not consider how much the studying and prosecuting these *foolish questions*, and needless Scrupulosities, doth eat out the *power of Godliness* and true Piety, and the *substantials* of Religion, while we busy our selves about these *shadows*; about little *circumstances* which do not at all influence the Substance of *spiritual* Worship.

There be so many *necessary duties*, and *indubitable truths*, in the serious practise of *Piety and Godliness*, that we need not trouble the heads of men (and make it our business so to do) with *doubtful disputations*.

It seems to be the design of the New Testament to take us off from the *Circumstantials* and *Scrupulosities* of Religion (which commonly produce strifes and contentions to no purpose) and put us upon *worshiping God in Spirit and in Truth*.

Si Deus est Animus, nobis ut carmina dicunt,
Hic tibi præcipue sit pura Mente colendus,

Was well enough said of the Poet; and is a good Paraphrase on that, *God is a Spirit and will be worshiped in Spirit and in Truth*. I have been told long since of a Grave Divine, who when asked, Why he did not Preach against *Long hair* (which was at that time more Offensive than now it is,) gave this Answer; If he could but Preach Jesus Christ into their *Hearts*; he should not much concern himself for their *Hair*.

This Author tells us, *p.* 49. *that our Liberty* Gal. 5. 1. *doth eminently consist in a Freedome not onely from the Ceremonial Law of old, but also in a Liberty not to be intangled with a new yoke of mens devices*. I take *needless Scrupulosities* to be such; the making of more Sins than God hath made; the making or pretending of those things to be Sins which are no sins, and putting a *religious Necessity* upon things which are matters of meer *Prudence* and *Discretion*. Like those 1 *Tim.* 4. 3. *Forbidding to Marry*, or (as I would rather render it) *Bidding not to Marry; and, to abstain from Meats*, &c. Forbidding things as *Unlawful* which are not so; is alike Superstitious as to Impose things as *holy* which are not Holy: and equally contrary to the *Liberty* there intended.

Whether the days be called *Saturday*, *Sunday*, *Monday*, or *Alpha*, *Beta*, *Gamma*, is all one to me, (I take them as I find them:) I think we ought not to foment quarels upon such trifles; and we sin if we do so.

Whether to meet once, or twice, or thrice, on a Sabbath-day, (if so as is most for edification and the real service of God,) is meerly

pru-

prudential in this or that place, without laying a *new religious yoke* where God leaves it to Prudence. And if, in *Prudentials*, things be not managed ſometimes with ſo much Prudence as we think they might, we muſt be content to bear with ſuch *Imprudences* as we cannot help; and better ſo, than to pull-on greater Inconveniences.

Whether to begin the Sabbath at Six or Ten or Twelve a Clock on Saturday-night, is a thing (I think) not worth contending about (ſo that it be religiouſly obſerved as to the Subſtantials of it,) and for which we ought not to diſturb the Church where we live, but to *follow righteouſneſs, charity, peace; and avoid fooliſh queſtions which gender ſtrife.*

And I ſhould not think it much more, whether *on this or that day*, ſo the Sabbath be well kept: and I would by no means, on that account, give a diſturbance to a Church where it is peaceably ſettled: 'Tis leſs material *When*, than *How*, a Sabbath be kept. And, in many caſes, it muſt be unavoidably left to Prudence, whether this or that day be called the *Firſt* or *Seventh* day of the Week. We are in ſuch caſes to ſtudy *the things that make for Peace*, and *wherewith one may edify another*. Rom. 14. 19. The fruits of the *ſpirit* are *love, joy, peace*, &c. but *variance, emulation, wrath, ſtrife*, are *fruits of the fleſh:* Gal. 5. 20, 21.

To ſtudy and ſpin out Diſputes into too fine a Threed (like that of a Spider out of her own Bowels) is but *to pervert* the Simplicity of the *Goſpel of Chriſt;* to make that *Abſtruſe* and *Difficult*, which the Scripture would have *Plain* and *Eaſy:* in *Speculatives* as well as *Practicals*. We ſhould mind the *ſubſtantials* of *ſpiritual worſhip;* and not dote upon *circumſtantials* further than as they do really advance the Subſtance. *Refuſe profane and old-wives fables, and exerciſe thy ſelf rather unto Godlineſs; for bodily exerciſe profiteth little*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 7, 8. Such are thoſe *Col.* 2. 20, 21. *Touch not, taſt not, handle not*, (and others of like nature) *all which periſh in the uſing*, (there is no real advantage doth accrew from the uſe of them; 'tis but labour loſt;) or ἃ ἐστι πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει *they are but miſchievous in their uſe.*

We complain of the Papiſts (and deſervedly) for *loading* their Worſhip with a *multitude* of *Ceremonies* and mimical *Geſtures;* the *number* of which would be a *Burthen*, even though *ſingly* they were Tolerable. Being ſo many *Diverſions* of the mind from Attending the *ſpirituality* of the Service. But *they* have ſome reaſon for it. For when much of their Devotion is either to be ſpoken ſo *low* as not to be *Heard*, or in ſuch a *Language* as not to be *underſtood*,

ſtood, they have need of ſomewhat to gratify the *Eye*, when the *Ear* is not *Edified*.

And it is almoſt the ſame miſchief, when mens Minds are amuſed with Nice Speculations and needleſs Scrupuloſities, whereby they are Diverted from the Subſtantials of Serious Religion.

Yet I would not ſo be underſtood, as if no care were to be had of *Corporeal* Worſhip, or the neceſſary Circumſtances attending it. (For God expects the Worſhip of the Body as well as the Soul, and *Religious* Actions muſt have their *Circumſtances*, as Time, Place, Geſture, and the like, as well as other *Actions*.) But theſe *Circumſtantials* ſhould be conſidered as *Circumſtances* (not as the *ſubſtance* of the Worſhip;) and as *Prudentials*; ſo to be managed (as in all other actions) as may, with Decency and Convenience, beſt advance the *ſpiritual* Worſhip; and may be varied according as the diverſity of times and places may require. Not to lay the Weight of *Divine Inſtitution* upon ſuch little things. As if, becauſe *Paul Kneeled down and Prayed* (*Act.* 20. 36.) therefore it were unlawful to uſe any other *Geſture* in Praying; Or as if, becauſe Chriſt bids, *when thou Prayeſt, enter into thy Cloſet and ſhut the door* (Mat. 6. 6.) therefore we may not pray in the Chamber, Parlour, Dining-Room, or Chappel: Or, becauſe Chriſt did Celebrate the Lords Supper, at *Night*, in an *Upper-room*, to *Men* onely, and but *Twelve*, and to thoſe *Sitting* or *Lying*; therefore we may not do it at *Noon* or *Morning*, in a *Low-room*, to *Women* as well as Men, in greater *Numbers*, or in ſome other *Geſture*. For though ſuch *Circumſtances* may be *Lawful*, and ſometimes *Adviſable* when *convenient*; yet to put a *Religious Neceſſity* upon them, as of *Divine Inſtitution*, looks like a piece of *Superſtition*.

And if we conſider ſeriouſly how great a miſchief many times ſome needleſs Scruples do create to the Church of God; *how great a matter a little fire kindles*; and how great hindrance to real Piety; it might juſtly make us wary how we add Fewel to ſuch a Flame, and rather bear with ſome things *we think* amiſs, (but may perhaps not be ſo) than by attempting to remove a ſuppos'd Evil create a greater Miſchief.

As to the preſent point in queſtion; I have ſaid ſo much upon the whole, as I think might ſatisfy the Gentleman if he well conſider it. Yet I know, when men have once eſpouſed a notion of which they are fond; and have ſo long pored upon it as to rivet it in their mind; catching at every little thing that may ſeem to favour it, and ſlighting whatever makes againſt it; (as we find our Author doth very often;) And that hardly any thing

thing can be ſaid ſo *plain*, as that there be nothing to be *cavilled* at, by one who is minded ſo to do; And that when God hath declared his will as plainly as he thinks *fit* to do, if men will not be contented with reaſonable evidence, he is not obliged to gratify their humours:

When (I ſay) we conſider this; It looks ſomewhat like what *Solomon* tells us *Prov.* 18. 19. of a *Brother offended*, harder to be won *than a ſtrong City*; and I muſt leave the ſucceſs to God, who *ſo teacheth as none like him.*

He remits us to two Writers on this Subject, in defenſe of the Chriſtian Sabbath, Mr *Shepheard* and Mr. *Hughs* (whom I have not read, nor have them at hand,) and Two others whom he names not (nor know I well whom he means, for more than two have ſince written;) who, he thinks, do tacitly retract ſomewhat that thoſe before had granted. And divers others have written on this Subject, though I have ſcarce conſulted any of them. And particularly I have not ſeen what is written by Dr. *Young* or Mr. *Warren*, whom I find cited in a late Book of *G. T.* which came out ſince this was Written and part of it printed. It is very poſſible, that ſome of thoſe may have ſaid much of what I now ſay, or that I may now ſay ſomewhat of what they have ſaid before. But, in this, there is no hurt. If in ſome particulars I vary from ſome of them; it is not becauſe I ſlight them, or out of a deſire to contradict them, but freely to ſpeak my own thoughts as they do theirs. Nor is it to be expected that all Writers on the ſame Subject ſhould agree in every particular, (Nor is he to make advantage of it; For *p.* 3. he owns it is ſo alſo with *thoſe who are for the ſeventh day*:) But as to the main (I preſume) we do well enough agree.

I have been a great deal longer than I did intend when I firſt began to write.

I ſhall give you a brief Summe of what I have ſaid to this purpoſe, as to both Queſtions. (For the Queſtion is double, though it ſeem to be but one.)

Firſt concerning the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, Whether that be Antiquated and at an end. Secondly, concerning the *Chriſtian Sabbath*, Whether there be ſufficient ground for this to ſucceed in the place thereof.

As to the firſt; I agree with him in many things which he proſecutes at large, though not peculiar to his Queſtion; As, That *Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* is *God;* that he is the Lord *Jehovah*, the God who *made the World*, who *reſted the ſeventh day*, who *brought*

brought Iſrael out of Egypt, and *gave the Law on Mount Sinai*; For there is no *other* God.

But, this I ſay, he did *as God* (in Union with the Father and Holy Ghoſt;) not as *Chriſt* (God and Man) our *Mediator* and *Redeemer*. For he was not *then* Man; nor was there occaſion of a Mediator and Redeemer before the fall.

I agree alſo that the Decalogue (or Ten Commandments) is Obligatory to us Gentiles; (as being for the ſubſtance of it, a Law before it was ſo delivered on Mount *Sinai*.) And that the Fourth Commandment concerning the Sabbath is one of them; which requires after *ſix days* of Labour, the *ſeventh* day to be a *Sabbath* or day of *Holy Reſt*. And our *Chriſtian Sabbath* is ſuch.

But it doth not ſay, *the ſeventh in courſe from the Creation*, nor doth it appear that the *Jewiſh* Sabbath was ſuch, but rather the Seventh day from the *firſt raining of Manna*.

I do agree alſo that *God himſelf* did reſt on the Seventh day from the Creation, *Gen.* 2. that is, He did *ceaſe* to *Create*.

But I do not there find, that *Man* did ſo reſt, or that there was any *expreſs command* for him ſo to do on that day; much leſs for ever after, on every Seventh day in courſe from the Creation. How much may be thought to be *implyed* in thoſe words, he *bleſſed and ſanctified it*, I will not diſpute; However, it is but by *Implication* not by any *expreſs command*; ſuch as our Author demands for the Chriſtian Sabbath.

Nor do I find that ever it was obſerved by *Man* till after the *Iſraelites* coming out of *Egypt*, or *expreſly commanded* ſo to be.

Nor do I find that any *other Nation* (beſide the Jews) did anciently ſo much as divide their time by *Weeks*. Since the times of Chriſtianity they have: But that they did ſo, long before that time, I do not find.

I do agree alſo that after *Iſraels* coming out of *Egypt* they did obſerve a *Sabbath*, Exod. 16.

But it was from a *new command*, (at *Marah* or *Elim*) which appeared *New* to them, not a continuation of a conſtant practiſe; and it was from a *new beginning* (the Seventh day from the firſt raining of *Manna*,) and as a *diſtinctive ſign* or *token*, of Gods being their *God* in a ſpecial manner, as contradiſtinguiſhed to other nations; (as himſelf owns *p.* 26. and 28.) and as a memorial of their *Refreſhing* after their *Bondage* and *Labour* in *Egypt*, and feeding them with *Bread from Heaven*.

I do preſume alſo that, they did, from this firſt raining of *Manna* continue a circulation of *Weeks* for a long time, and perhaps till the time of our *Saviour*.

Yet

Yet we are not ſure but that it might be intermitted in the *ſeventy years* of the *Babyloniſh* Captivity, and the day forgotten; and then reſtored a-new by *Nehemiah* (from a new beginning) *Neh.* 13. as he reſtored the *Feaſt of Tabernacles* (Chap. 8.) which had been intermitted *from the days of Joſhua the ſon of Nun to that day.* But I rather think, the memory was preſerved (by Tradition) during thoſe *ſeventy years.*

I agree alſo that the Church of the Jews was the *moſt* viſible Church of God, but I am loth to ſay (with him, *p.* 79.) it was *the whole viſible Church;* For I preſume there might be many *Good men* of other Nations, who worſhiped the *true God* (of whom we have no Hiſtory,) though not joined to the Jewiſh Church, nor were (that I know of) obliged ſo to be. Such was *Melchizedek* (whoever he were) not of the ſeed of *Abraham*, much leſs of *Iſrael.* And ſuch was *Job*, and his *Friends* from divers Countries (of whom, were it not for the ſtory of *Job*, we ſhould have had no knowledge,) nor are we to think theſe were the *onely perſons* of thoſe Countries who worſhiped the true God. And how many ſuch were in other Nations, we cannot tell. Who might, if they had opportunity, join as *Proſelites* with the *Jewiſh* Church, when eſtabliſhed. But I do not think they were *neceſſarily obliged* ſo to do, or to keep the *ſame Sabbath* with them.

For I take it to be true, even before Chriſts coming, that *God is no reſpecter of perſons; but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteouſneſs, is accepted with him.* Act. 10. 34, 35. *Whether Jew or Greek*, Rom. 2. 10, 11. 1 Pet. 1. 17. Which are but Quotations from *Deut.* 10. 19.

Nor do I find that any Nation, except the *Jews*, did obſerve the *Jewiſh* Sabbath. But I rather take it to be a *diſtinctive ſign* of them from other Nations, *Ex.* 31. 13, 17. as *Circumciſion* and the *Paſs-over* were; which, when the *wall of partition* was taken away, ceaſed alſo.

Yet, as to what was Moral in them (the *Circumciſion of the heart* being pointed at by that of the *Fleſh;* and the *old leaven of malice and wickedneſs* to be put away inſtead of that of *Bread;* and a *reſt from Sin* of more reſpect with God than that from *Labour;*) we have inſtead thereof, *Baptiſm*, in the room of *Circumciſion;* the *Lords Supper*, in the room of the *Paſs-over;* and the *Lords Day* or *Chriſtian Sabbath*, inſtead of the *Jewiſh.* And, as that took date from the raining of *Manna* after their deliverance from *Egypt;* ſo ours from the *Reſurrection of Chriſt*, the true *Manna.*

I agree alſo that the *Apoſtle*, and other *Chriſtians*, even after Chriſts Reſurrection, did go to the *Temple* and the Jewiſh *Synagogues* on their

Sabbath days (and did there aſſiſt at *Prayers*, and *Reading the Law*, and other ſervices common to Jews and Chriſtians) on a like account as when we now meet to *hear a Sermon*, or keep a *Faſt* or *Thanksgiving* on a *Week-day*.

But ſo they did as to *Circumciſion*, and other *Jewiſh Rites*. As when *Paul* circumciſed *Timothy*, and joined in the Jewiſh Rites of *Purification*, Act. 21. on account of thoſe *believing Jews* who were yet *zealous of the Law*: To teſtify to them that he had been miſrepreſented by thoſe who ſaid he did teach *the Jews which are among the Gentiles* to *forſake Moſes*, and that they *ought not to circumciſe their Children*, *nor to walk after the Cuſtoms*. Whereas indeed he taught that *Gentiles* ought ſo to forbear, (as being a *new yoke* to which before they were not ſubject,) but as to the *Jews which were amongſt the Gentiles* he did allow them (if not yet ſatisfied of their Chriſtian Liberty) ſo to practiſe. For he puts a great difference between the *Gentiles*, and the *Jews among the Gentiles*; of which I doubt our Author doth not take notice; elſe he would not tell us (*p.*39.) of *Paul's writing one thing, and practiſing another*. He preached and wrote *againſt Circumciſion* as to the *Gentiles*; but allowed it to the *Jews*; and himſelf practiſed it, As to *Timothy* (a Jew) but not as to *Titus* who was *no Jew*. And the like we may ſay as to the *Jewiſh Sabbath* on *their* Seventh day.

As to what Services were peculiarly *Chriſtian* (as *breaking of Bread*) they did it not at the Temple or Synagogues, but κατ' οἶκον *at home*, or *from houſe to houſe*, Act. 2. 46. and on another day, the *firſt day of the Week*, Act. 20. 7.

Now this is all that he hath to urge, for the *Jewiſh* Sabbath in particular: which he cannot ſhew to be commanded to *all the World* (but rather to them in particular in contradiſtinction to the reſt of the World,) nor that it was a *Seventh day from the Creation*, but from the firſt raining of *Manna*. For the Fourth Commandment ſaith nothing of *this Sabbath* in particular, but onely of the *ſeventh* day after *ſix days of labour*.

As to that Imperious demand, *p.* 40,48,64. *Where is there any ſuch Power recorded in Scripture to be given to any Man or Men whatſoever, after Chriſt had ſaid It is finiſhed, to alter the Seventh-day Sabbath inſtituted by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt?* I doubt he hath forgotten that the *ſame God* who gave the Law of the *Ten Commandments*, gave alſo the *Ceremonial Law*; and if it were *the Lord Jeſus Chriſt* who gave the one, it was he that gave the other alſo. And will he then ask *Where is there any power recorded in ſcripture to be given to any man or number of men to aboliſh* Circumciſion and the reſt of the Moſaick Rites inſti-

inſtituted by the Lord Jeſus Chriſt? I know no ſuch power *recorded in Scripture to be given*, as to *Circumciſion* and the reſt, more than as to the *Jewiſh Sabbath*. And we find them both put together *Col.* 2. 11, 16. Or will he ſay, *Where is any Power recorded in Scripture to be given to any Man or Men, (after Chriſt had ſaid It is finiſhed,)* to appoint Elders and Deacons and other Officers in the Chriſtian Church, and give Orders concerning it, which Chriſt (before he ſo ſaid,) had not given? Yet we know *Circumciſion* was aboliſhed, and ſuch *Officers* and *Orders* given. So that all this is but Flouriſh.

As to that of Chriſt having ſaid *It is finiſhed;* whatever be meant by that, we know that the whole Order and Conſtitution of the Chriſtian Church was ſettled after that time: And whatever elſe be ſignified by it, it is not meant that there was nothing to be done further concerning it; For, if ſo, to what purpoſe did Chriſt *give Commandments to his Apoſtles, of things pertaining to the Kingdome of God* after his Reſurrection, if nothing were to be further done?

And if we conſider the Apoſtles deportment; We do not find them any where inſiſt *Authoritatively* upon a *Power* given them from Chriſt, to *Abrogate Circumciſion* or the like, and thereupon to proceed *pro imperio*. But they *Argue* it from the nature of the thing, That what was *Typical* of Chriſt, was at an end now *Chriſt is come;* That what was *Diſtinctive* of the Jews from other Nations, was now to ceaſe when *the partition wall was broken down;* That what were but *ſhadows* as to the *Subſtantials* of Religion, were now to paſs away, as *beggarly Rudiments*, Chriſt regarding the *Body* or *Subſtance* not the *Shadows;* ἃ ἐστι σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, theſe are but *ſhadows* in compariſon of what Chriſt came to ſettle, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *but 'tis the Body* (the Subſtance) *that Chriſt reſpects*, Col. 2. 17.

They do not *Command*, but *Argue*. They do no where pretend that God or Chriſt had given them Authority to *Abrogate a Law* which God had made: But Argue (from the nature of the thing) that the *Law was ceaſed;* and was not intended to Oblige longer: That the Law was now *Antiquated* or *Expired* when the End for which it was made was attained: That the *Types* were at an *End*, when the Thing *Typified* was Exhibited: That the *Diſtinctive Marks* were now no more of Uſe, when Jews and Gentiles were *United:* That the *Elements* or *Rudiments* (στοιχεῖα) which God (for reaſons beſt known to himſelf) thought fit for the *Training-up* of his Church while as in a State of *Minority* (wherein a *Child* though *Heir of All* doth little differ from a *Servant*) ſhould now ceaſe when it comes to *full Age*, Gal. 4. And to the ſame purpoſe *Heb.* 8. He argues that the *Old Covenant* was at an end when a *Better Covenant* was come in

the room; citing that of *Jer.* 31. *Behold the days come, ſaith the Lord, when I will make a New Covenant with the houſe of Iſrael and with the houſe of Judah: Not according to the Covenant which I made with their Fathers when I led them out of the land of Egypt, For this is the Covenant that I will make, That I will put my laws into their Mind, and write them in their Hearts.* Meaning, inſtead of an outward Ceremonial Service, he would eſtabliſh a ſervice more Spiritual. From whence he concludes the *Antiquation* of the Former: *In that he ſaith a New Covenant, he hath made the firſt Old: Now that which Decayeth and waxeth Old, is ready to Vaniſh away.* They do not claim a *Power*, to *Aboliſh a Law of Gods making*; But prove by *Argument*, that theſe Laws are *Antiquated* or *Expired*; as not being intended, by the Law-maker, to bind longer than till ſuch a time. As *Rom.* 7. *The Woman is bound by the Law to her Husband as long as he lives; But if the husband be Dead, ſhe is free from the Law:* Not that *the Law is Aboliſhed*; but *the Caſe is Altered.*

And it is from theſe Conſiderations that he *Argues* againſt *Circumciſion* Col. 2. 11. and the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, ver. 16. For as to the *Subſtantials* of the Service, provided a Sabbath be duly kept, it is much one whether on the *Seventh* or the *Firſt* day. Now theſe (Subſtantials) are (he tells us *p.* 83.) *a lively ſpiritual Converſe with the Father, Son and Holy-Ghoſt, in private Duties and publick Ordinances (where they can be had,) and in a Holy Reſt all that day, ſaving emergent caſes of Neceſſity and Mercy.* Which may be equally done on either day.

But as to thoſe who were not ſatisfied with theſe *Arguments*; (if they were ſuch as were before under thoſe Commands) he doth not urge his *Authority*; He leaves them to practiſe according to their own judgment (but without cenſuring others) till they ſhall be better ſatisfied, as in *Rom.* 14. But as to the *Gentiles*, who had never been under theſe Laws, the caſe was otherwiſe. Which makes him argue otherwiſe with the (Gentile) *Galatians*, *Epheſians*, and *Coloſſians*, than with the Chriſtian *Jews* at *Rome.*

And as to his Queſtion, *p.* 47. *When, where, and by whom*, it was taken away, I ſay *Then, there, and by the ſame*, who took away *Circumciſion* and the other *Moſaick* Rites. That is, *Fundamentally* by *Chriſt* at his death *who nailed them to his Croſs*, after which they ceaſed to be Obligatory; But *Executively* and *Practically* by his Apoſtles, and the Chriſtian Church, according as they did (leiſurably and in time) come to underſtand their Liberty.

All which we are to preſume they did according to ſuch directions as Chriſt gave them. For (as this Author obſerves *p.* 80.) *Paul,*

in

in those Primitive times, when the Ceremonial Law was fresh in memory, and the Gospel newly preached, had much a-do to remove the first converted Jews from Circumcision and other Ceremonials, (and so from their *Jewish Sabbath;*) therefore these things were to wear off by degrees, and not to be *torn from them* all at once.

And this I think is enough (to a person not prejudiced) as to the *Removal of the (then) Jewish Sabbath;* appointed by *Moses* after their coming out of *Egypt*, on the *seventh day* from the *first raining of Manna*, and not given to *all the world*, but to be a *distinctive sign* of them from other Nations.

Now as to the other Point in Question, the *Observation of the Lords day:* I would ground that originally on the *Fourth Commandment;* which doth appoint a *Seventh day of Holy Rest*, after *Six days of Ordinary Labour.* Which doth directly concern the *Substantials* of Worship (that a Sabbath be kept and God thus served), but whether on this or that day of the Seven, is meerly Circumstantial, and (as *Paul* calls it) a *Shadow*, in comparison of the *Body* or *Substance*, which is, he tells us, what *Christ* respects.

But then as to that, Why the *First day* rather than another? I answer, First, Here was a much more memorable Accident, of *Christs Resurrection*; than was that of *Raining Manna*, from whence the Jewish Sabbath takes its date, as the Seventh day from it (not from the Creation) or that of the *Quails* the Night before, (the first day that God fed them by Miracle from Heaven,) And therefore stands as fair for beginning such a Circulation of Weeks and Sabbaths.

We are told *Jer.* 16. 14, 15. and *Jer.* 23, 7, 8. *Behold the days come (saith the Lord) that it shall no more be said, The Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; But, The Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel out of the North Country.* Not, that the former deliverance was to be forgotten; but a greater than it did make it (comparatively) to disappear (as when the light of the Sun doth obscure that of the Moon and Stars;) And so here, the *Resurrection of Christ* to be commemorated paramount to that of former Mercies.

Next, in pursuance of this Occasion, we find our Saviour did on that day of his *Resurrection*, appear to *Mary Magdalen* and the other Women, declaring to them the *Doctrine of the Resurrection*, then, to the two Disciples going to *Emmaus*, *Preaching* to them (at large) the same Doctrine, and Celebrating with them the *Lords Supper*; and afterward (the same day) to those assembled at *Jerusalem* (with other Sabbatical works) and solemnly *Blessing* that Convention. And if our Author by *blessing the Seventh day* Gen. 2. would have us under-

stand

ſtand an *Inſtitution* or *Command to obſerve it;* We have as much here; Chriſt *joined* in this Aſſembly, and *Bleſſed* it. For ſo much is intimated in that his ſolemn *Benediction* (a firſt and ſecond time, *Joh.* 20. 19, 21.) *Peace be unto you; and he Breathed on them ſaying, Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt.*

He did ſo a ſecond time on the ſame day the next Week; he *Aſſembled* with them (in Religious Services) and *Bleſſed* them.

He did (according to his Promiſe made on that Firſt day of his Reſurrection) ſend on them that miraculous *Effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt* on the day of *Pentecoſt*, which being the Fiftieth day from his Reſurrection, was therefore the *firſt day of the week* as was that of the Reſurrection. On which day of Pentecoſt we find them alſo otherwiſe exerciſed in Religious Employments, and atteſted further by a miraculous converſion of *three thouſand ſouls.*

We find St. *Paul* at *Troas* Act. 20. *Preaching to the Diſciples aſſembled* (as it ſeems their manner was) *on the firſt day of the week to break bread;* that is, to celebrate the *Lords Supper.*

That ſuch Aſſemblies were wont to be at *Corinth*, *on the firſt day of the Week*, the Apoſtle preſumes, or takes for granted; and gives direction for a *Collection* to be then made, 1 *Cor.* 16.

And he had ſo done before, as he there ſignifies, to the *Churches of Galatia;* preſuming or taking for granted, that they alſo did ſo uſe to meet on the firſt day of the Week.

And we have no reaſon to doubt but that ſuch Meetings were wont to be in other Churches. We cannot doubt but that other of the Apoſtles did diſperſe themſelves in other parts of the World, though we have not a like account of their Travels, as we have of *Paul's* recorded by St. *Luke:* But we are to preſume (though it be not recorded) that their Doctrine and Practiſe was conſonant to his; and that accordingly they had ſuch weekly meetings on the Lords Day as theſe Churches had of whom we have the Hiſtory.

Hence that day had the name given of *the Lords day*, κυριακὴ, as we find it called *Rev.* 1. 10. (as that of the Sacrament is called Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον *the Lords Supper*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 20.) which name it retaineth to this day, and for ſuch purpoſe.

And all this, I think, is ſufficient for us to continue our Obſervation of the ſame day. I am ſure 'tis much more than he can ſhew for his *ſeventh-day Sabbath* for more than *two thouſand five hundred years* from the firſt Creation.

It is not neceſſary that we have *expreſs words of Command* Recorded. We have no *Record* in Scripture of ſuch *expreſs words of Command* for the *Seventh-day Sabbath*, till after *Iſrael's coming out of Egypt*, nor

nor for the *Worſhiping of God by Sacrifice*; nor for other things which yet were *Duties* before any *Record* of ſuch expreſs words of *Command*. It is enough if we can otherwiſe Collect it to be Gods Will, according to the beſt light we have.

If this Gentleman think himſelf obliged to keep the Jewiſh Sabbath *alſo*: this doth not hurt us. This, I think, was the caſe of the *Chriſtian Jews* at firſt. I do not much queſtion but that they did, as other Chriſtians, obſerve the Lords Day. The doubt was, whether they were not to obſerve *alſo* the Jewiſh Sabbath as before they did. And theſe *Believers* who were yet *zealous of the Law*, and thought themſelves obliged, *together with Chriſtianity*, to obſerve the *Law of Moſes*, did no doubt think themſelves equally obliged to the *Jewiſh Sabbath*. Thoſe who thought themſelves obliged to be *Baptized*, and to be *Circumciſed alſo*, thought themſelves in like manner obliged to obſerve the *Lords day* and alſo the *Jewiſh Sabbath*. And (till they ſhould be better ſatified) the Apoſtles permit (*the Jews*) ſo to do.

If this do not ſatisfy him; I have yet two Expedients for him.

1. Let him begin his *Week* on *Monday*, and then *Sunday* will be the *Seventh day*. Whether the Seventh in courſe *from the Creation*, I cannot tell; nor can any Man living inform me. But it will at leaſt be the *Seventh* day of *His* Week.

2. If he be not ſatisfied with this: My next Expedient is thus. Let him take a Voyage round the World, as Sir *Francis Drake* did. Going out of the *Atlantick Ocean* Weſt-ward by the Streights of *Magellan* to the Eaſt-Indies; and then, from the Eaſt, returning by the *Cape of Good Hope* (the uſual way) homeward. And take with him as many as pleaſe of thoſe who are of his mind. And let them keep their *Saturday-Sabbath* all the way. When they come home to *England*, they will find their *Saturday* to fall upon our *Sunday*; and they may thenceforth continue to obſerve their *Saturday-Sabbath* on the ſame day with us. Which is the ſecond Expedient.

If you ask, How this can be? I will make it very plain, that ſo it *will* be, and ſo it *muſt* be. For, Suppoſing the Earth to be Round, and the Sun moving from Eaſt to Weſt; you muſt allow that it comes ſooner to the Eaſtern parts than to the Weſtern. It will ſooner be *Noon* in *Holland* than in *England*, and ſooner here than in *Ireland*.

If you ask, How much ſooner? We ſay, that *Fifteen Degrees* of Longitude Weſt-ward, makes it an *Hour* later. As if he Embark about *Dover*, *Yarmouth*, or other Port on the Eaſt-ſide of *England*, and Sail as far Weſt-ward as the Weſt of *Ireland* (or a little farther) it will be an *Hour* later, and not be *Noon* there till it be *One a Clock*

at

at the place where he Embarked. And ſo in proportion, an *Hour* for every *Fifteen degrees*. And accordingly, when he hath gone round the whole Circle of *Three hundred and Sixty Degrees*, (that is Four and twenty times Fifteen,) it will be later by *Four and twenty* hours, That is, it will be but *Saturday-noon* with him, when it is *Sunday-noon* with thoſe who ſtaid here. That is, His *Saturday* will be Our *Sunday*. And thenceforth his *Saturday-Sabbath* will be the ſame day with our *Sunday-Sabbath* ever after.

And this, I think, ſhould fully ſatisfy him. For he tells us, *p.* 39. *The variety of the time of the Sun-riſing or ſetting in different Climates doth no way diſturb; for that a day longer or ſhorter is ſtill a day, and but a day.*

Moſt certain it is he who ſhall have thus Sailed round the World will have had one day fewer than thoſe who ſtaid here. So it was with Sir *Francis Drake* and his Company: And ſo it hath been with all who have taken ſuch a Voyage, (as many have done, for it is not a rare caſe:) and ſo will be to any who ſhall ſo do.

What he would reſolve upon this caſe, or what he thinks Sir *Francis Drake* was to do when this happened; I cannot tell.

If he would go on to reckon the days according as they had happened to him in his Voyage; then this Expedient muſt fully ſatisfy him. For then he keeps his *Saturday-Sabbath* on our *Sunday*.

If he thinks the account ſhould be rectified when or before he comes home, and call the days thenceforth as he finds thoſe to do that ſtaid here, what ſhall be come of that day he hath loſt? and which day of the Week ſhall he reckon that to be?

And When muſt he rectify that account? when he comes home, or ſomewhere by the way? For it would be juſt the ſame, if, before he come at *England*, he ſhould have landed in *France* or *Spain*, or on the Coaſt of *Africk*, or even at the *Eaſt-Indies*, and all the way from thence, he would ſtill be a day behind them. And ſo he would be with every Ship that in his way he ſhould meet with. If he and ſuch other Ship meet at the Iſle of St. *Helens* to take freſh water, his *Saturday* will be their *Sunday*; and on which of the two days are they to keep their *Sabbath*? or muſt they keep it one on the one day, and the other on the other?

If he ſay that the account is to be rectified by the way (before he comes home) then Where? or When? and by What rule? For when ever he doth ſo rectify it, he muſt then begin to call *Sunday* what juſt before he was to call *Saturday*.

If he ſay, This muſt be left to Diſcretion, when, and where: Then muſt it be matter of diſcretion (and not determin'd by the Fourth Commandment) on which of the two days in queſtion the Sabbath ſhall be kept.

But

But then here will again come in our amazing demand (as p. 48, 86, 87.) *What man or men, without an high Usurpation of the Divine Authority, contrary to the First Commandment, shall, with pretended good intentions, assume an authority of their own heads, to appoint* (for this or that place; suppose the *Streights of Magellan*) *what day shall be the Lords holy Sabbath? Who, but our Lord Jesus Christ, that is Lord of the Sabbath, hath power to institute a Sabbath-day? If the Church or any part thereof be once admitted to have such Power, what Bolts or Locks will be strong enough for such a Door, to keep it from letting in upon the Churches of Christ what soever pleaseth those in Power?*

I shall not much trouble my self to answer all this *Warmth*. But (when that is over) if at or near the *Streights of Magellan* (a place, I think, not inhabited, or not by Christian,) a Colony be planted by some from hence, and some from the East-Indies; those who come thither from hence will (according to their account) call that *Saturday*, which those who come thither from the other side will (according to their account) call *Sunday*. Must they have no Sabbath at all? (that's against the Fourth Commandment:) Or must they by consent agree upon the day? (this I should think, if he would give me leave:) Or must they keep it some upon one day some on the other? This I would by no means advise, if it may be avoided: Because it would be a manifest confusion and disorder; And they would not both (if either) be the *Seventh-day* in course *from the Creation*. And which of them is so, is not possible for any man to know. And it would be more for *common Edification* that they do agree upon a common day. And not much matter, whether of the Two.

This Gentleman, if he can consider of it calmly, I am apt to think will be of the same mind; and think it better to have such a Sabbath than none at all; and that the little circumstance, whether on this or that day, should be disregarded in comparison of the *Substantials* of the Duty.

There be many things which the *Word of God* or the *Divine Law* doth determine *in Thesi*, which when *in Hypothesi* they come in practise, will require the intervention of *Prudentials* or *Humane* Laws. The Eighth Commandment says, I must not *Steal*, or take unduly from my Neighbour what is His: But, What is Mine, and what is my Neighbours, will depend much upon Humane Laws; and, what shall be reputed a Trespass on my Neighbours land; or, a forfeiture of his right. The Seventh Commandment says, *Thou shalt not commit Adultery*: But it will depend much upon Humane Law, what shall be reputed a Good Marriage. The Sixth Commandment says *Thou shalt not Kill*: But it will much depend upon Humane Law what shall be re-

puted Self-defenſe, or a Juſt War, or a Forfeiture of Life. The Fifth Commandment requires us to *Honour and Obey our Parents*; But, in many caſes, 'tis Humane Law that is to determine, who is to be reputed the Father. If a Widow be left whith Child by a former Huſband, and marry another before that Child be born (which ſometime happens;) 'twill be a point in Law, not in Divinity, to whether of the Two Fathers this Son ſhall be Heir. And if my Father require me to part with what Eſtate is my own, 'twill be a point in Law, how far I am required to obey ſuch a Command. (And the like as to other *Superiours*, as well as *Natural* Parents.) And thoſe Laws which ſeem Abſolute (as *Thou ſhalt not Kill*, *Thou ſhalt not Steal*, &c.) Have yet their Tacite *Limitations* implied. For no man doubts but there are caſes wherein *to Kill* may be lawful; as in *Self-defenſe*, in a *juſt War*, and for *Capital Crimes*; And in ſuch caſes, to *take from* our Neighbour what was His. And, notwithſtanding the Command of *Honour thy Father and Mother*, or that of *Children obey your Parents in all things*; there may things happen, wherein we are not obliged to do what they bid us. And in all ſuch caſes there is room for *Prudence* to interpoſe. Not, to Abrogate or Repeal a Law of God; But to judge what is the true Intent of that Law. So not withſtanding that Command of the Sabbath, *In it thou ſhall do no manner of work*; yet our Saviour tells us, *The Prieſts in the Temple profane the Sabbath and are blameleſs*; and againſt the Phariſees *ſuperſtitious rigour* he argues, not onely from his own Authority (*The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath-day*) But from the *Reaſon of the Law*, *The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath*; and conſequently is ſo to be underſtood as may be for the *Good of Man* (ſpiritual and bodily) not for his *Hurt*. And our Author allows the *emergent caſes of Neceſſity and Mercy*; And no man doubts but that if a *Houſe be on Fire*, we may *Labour to quench it*. In all which caſes *Prudence* may be *uſed*, but muſt not (upon that pretenſe) be *Abuſed*. Not as if it were left to our Prudence, whether or no the Law of God ſhall be Obeyed; But, what is, in ſuch caſes, the true *Intendment* of the Law of God. And there needs no other *Locks or Bolts* (as our Author ſpeaks) to confine *Prudence* in ſuch caſes, than in all other *Prudential* Acts. So when the Fourth Commandment requires us *to keep holy the Sabath-day*; it may yet, in many caſes, depend much upon Prudence or Humane Laws, which day ſhall be reputed the *Sabbath*. And if this Author tell us, it muſt be the *Seventh* in courſe *from the Creation*; We are never a whit the nearer. For though he take great pleaſure, on all occaſions, to exclaim againſt *Tradition*, yet he muſt admit *a great deal of Tradition* to intervene before he can prove this or that day to be a Seventh in courſe from the Creation.

I

I am apt to think alſo, that when he hath well conſider'd the caſe of Sr. *Francis Drake* (and many more ſince that time, who ſailing round the world, as he did, have loſt a day,) he will come to one of theſe two Reſolutions: Either that when he comes back to *England* he muſt continue to call that *Saturday* which on his account was ſo; (and then his *Saturday-Sabbath* will be the ſame with our *Sunday:*) Or elſe that his account muſt be ſomewhere rectified in his Voyage by skipping a day; and then and there beginning to call *Sunday* what, juſt before, he was to call *Saturday*.

Now becauſe there is nothing in Nature to determine where this *muſt* be; nor is there any thing of divine Inſtitution (that I know of) to determine where it *ſhall* be; It ſeems to me to be Prudential, or moſt rational, (if nothing intervene to counterbalance it,) to be at what we call the *firſt Meridian*, from whence we reckon the Degrees of Longitude, Eaſt-ward, 1, 2, 3, *&c.* and ſo onward till we come round to 360, at the ſame Meridian again; and thence begin to reckon onward 1, 2, 3, *&c.* as before, for another round.

This firſt Meridian, in *Ptolemy*'s time, was accounted to be about the Weſtern part of the *African* ſhore; as being the moſt Weſtern part of the World then known. Of later times, Geographers have been pleaſed to remove it more Weſt, about the Iſlands called *Azores*, or the *Flemiſh Iſlands*. But all agree to place it between *our Continent* and that of *America*. And if from that Meridian, from whence we reckon the beginning of Longitude, we reckon alſo the beginning of Days; then the laſt of *Saturday* muſt there end, and the firſt of *Sunday* muſt there begin. And therefore at that Meridian the ſailers round the World ſhould rectify their account, calling it *Saturday* on the one ſide of it, and *Sunday* on the other; that being the *lateſt* of *Saturday*, and the *ſooneſt* of *Sunday*.

He will tell me perhaps, that, by this account, if *We* keep our Sabbath on *Sunday*, thoſe in *New-England* muſt be ſaid to keep theirs on *Monday*, as being on the other ſide of that Meridian. And 'tis true, it would ſo follow. And therefore I did interpoſe, *if nothing elſe do intervene to counterbalance it*. And this is what I did at firſt intimate, as diſputable, whether we and they in *New-England* are to be ſaid to keep our Sabbath on the ſame day.

But it is the ſame caſe as to the whole Continent of *America*. And the ſame reſolution will reach all.

And therefore, the thing being once ſettled by the common conſent of all, I would by no means adviſe to change the day.

For the placing the *firſt Meridian* is purely *Arbitrary*. It might as well have been placed beyond *America*, (if men had ſo pleaſed,

and that *America* had been known in *Ptolemy's* time) as on this ſide: (And we might have numbred our Degrees of Longitude Weſtward, as now we do Eaſtward:) And may be ſo reputed now, if men ſo pleaſe (as it is now reputed about 10 or 15 degrees more to the Weſtward than it was in *Ptolemy's* days.)

And it is purely *Arbitrary*, where to begin to change the name of the day which is to be ſo called; whether at the Firſt Meridian, or elſe-where.

And conſequently 'tis purely *Arbitrary* or *Diſcretional*, whether in *America* ſuch day ſhall be called *Sunday* or *Monday*. There is nothing in the *fourth Commandment*, nor in the *Word of God*, to determine it.

But it ſo happening, that *America* hath been peopled from *Europe*, traveling Weſtward from hence (without taking notice that we croſs the firſt Meridian,) we have reckoned the days (and ſo named them) according as they appeared to thoſe upon their Voyage who went thither. Whereas if it had been peopled (I mean, as to the Chriſtians there) from *Aſia* and the *Eaſt-Indies* (by people coming thence to the other ſide of *America*) what there is now called *Sunday*, would (for the like reaſon) have been called *Monday*: and the Fourth Commandment equally obſerved either way.

And upon a like account Chriſtians in the *Eaſt-Indies*, and in *China* and *Japan*, traveling Eaſtward from hence thither, do call their days there according as they appeared to fall out to them in the courſe of their Voyage.

Now 'tis true, that ſome part of the day which we here call Sunday, is coincident with ſome part of what is ſo called in *Japan*, and alſo ſome part of our Sunday (though not the ſame part) is coincident with part of theirs in *America*. But very little of theirs in the Eaſt of *Japan*, with theirs in the Weſt of *America*. About Eleven a clock at night in the one (or yet later) before it begins to be one a clock in the morning in the other, (ſcarce an hour in common) according to our ancient Maps. (Our later Maps make it ſomewhat more, as if it might be Ten at night in the one, when it begins to be Two in the morning at the other.) Yet theſe paſs for the ſame *Sunday*. And 'tis well enough ſo to reckon.

But it is *Prudentially* ſo: Becauſe the chief Trade and intercourſe of *America*, is with *Europe*; not with *Aſia*. And therefore it is conſidered as lying *Weſt* from *Europe*; rather than as *Eaſt* from *Japan*. And accordingly it is ſo placed in our Maps. And though we continue to reckon our *Longitude* as from a Meridian between *Us* and *America*, yet the account of our *days* we begin as from a Meridian beyond it, between *America* and *Aſia*. Which

Which is not ſaid to raiſe *new ſcruples*, (as if I would adviſe an alteration of a received computation; which is well enough as it is; and I know not how to mend it:) But to ſhew there is an unavoidable Neceſſity of leaving much to *Prudential* conſiderations, What day ſhall be reputed *Sunday*, and what the *Sabbath*, in this or that place. And therefore it cannot reaſonably be thought the deſign of the *fourth Commandment* to confine us to ſuch *Circumſtantial Niceties*, which do not at all influence the *ſubſtantials of Worſhip*.

The *fourth Commandment* requires the *ſeventh* day of Holy *Reſt*, after *ſix* days of ordinary *Labour*. But of a Seventh day in courſe *from the Creation* to be ſo obſerved, it ſaith nothing: Nor is it poſſible for us to know. The *Jews* obſerved a *ſeventh* day in courſe from the *firſt raining of Manna*; but I do not know how that concerns us; or, if it did, how we ſhall know which is that day? (for this Gentleman will not allow *Tradition* to be a good proof.) *We* obſerve a *ſeventh* day in courſe from what (we think) the *Apoſtles did obſerve*. If we miſtake our reckoning (which I think we do not) it is not a *Culpable* Ignorance; for it is according to the beſt Light we have. This day we are in *poſſeſſion* of, and the Chriſtian Church hath ſo been for *many Hundred* years. And he that would diſpoſſeſs us of it, muſt ſhew a better Title. (The old rule is, *Poſſidentis potior eſt ratio.*) To *change* meerly *for change ſake*, is Fooliſh. If he would lay a *Divine Neceſſity* on us to obſerve the *Jewiſh Sabbath* from the firſt raining of *Manna* (if at leaſt that be the day by them obſerved in our Saviours time;) he muſt make it clear to us, which is that day (by a better argument, if he can, than *Tradition*:) And, that we are *of neceſſity obliged* to that day; which was (himſelf acknowledges) a *diſtinctive ſign* of them from *other Nations*, as *Circumciſion* alſo was. And if *this diſtinctive mark* (when the *partition wall is* broken down) do as much ceaſe as that did: 'Tis as truly *ſuperſtition* now to put a *neceſſity* upon it, as upon *Circumciſion*. Which though the Apoſtles would, for a while, permit to the Jews; (to whom it had once been a Law) till they ſhould be better ſatisfied; Yet would by no means allow to the *Gentiles*, to whom it had not before been a Law. And I think the caſe is juſt the ſame of the *Jewiſh Sabbath* as contradiſtinguiſhed to the *Lords day*.

I am

Yours, &c.

FINIS.